```
Cbq1mer1
1
 2
                           APPEARANCES (Continued)
 3
      GARY BECKER
 4
      ALEX LESMAN
           Attorneys for Defendant Miranda
 5
      ALSO PRESENT:
      Special Agent Patrick Collins, ATF
6
      Paralegal Specialist Darci Brady
 7
 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

(Trial resumed)

(In open court; jury not present)

THE COURT: Good morning, once again, to everyone.

Are there any issues that counsel wish to raise?

MS. HELLER: Your Honor, we only have one issue. We were handed this morning two demonstratives, exhibits that Mr. Lee I believe intends on using in his summation, and so we could certainly wait until the lunch break to address those, but we did have objections to those.

THE COURT: All right. Well, let's see if we can deal with what's coming up. I haven't seen Mr. Lee's demonstratives, so -- Mr. Miedel?

MR. MIEDEL: Yes, your Honor. I have a matter that, unfortunately, only occurred to me about 1:00 last night. And it concerns charges, particularly the Count One, the substantive RICO count. It occurred to me that under the evidence, at least the evidence that came — the way it came in at this trial, one would seem to have to be — conviction on Count One would have to be a prerequisite for a conviction of the counts involving Mr. Pierce that are the murder in aid of racketeering and attempted murder in aid of racketeering. The reason is that, theoretically, it's possible that the jury could find Mr. Pierce not guilty of the RICO count, either — well, if it found Mr. Pierce not guilty of the RICO count because it didn't find an enterprise, then it seems to me that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

it would have to also find him quilty -- not quilty of the substantive acts in aid of racketeering. If it found him not quilty because they didn't think he was a member, the same result. And if they found that he hadn't committed at least two pattern acts, I guess it's theoretically possible they could find him quilty of the substantive acts but not both, because he's charged with the, you know, the murder in aid of racketeering and then the attempted murder in aid of racketeering of the killing of -- I mean, the attempted shooting of Tarean Joseph. They would not be able to find both of those and still acquit him of the RICO charge. lead to a -- an inconsistent result, where the jury could find him not quilty of RICO and yet find him quilty of the substantive acts in aid of racketeering. And I think that the jury needs to have an instruction on that. And the way it's set up in the verdict sheet, you know, it starts at this point now with the substantive acts. They could go -- if they go in order, let's say they find him quilty of the substantive acts and they eventually get down to RICO and they find him not quilty, it would be an inconsistent verdict.

Now there is a theoretical way that somebody can not be a member of the enterprise and still commit acts in furtherance of that enterprise by, for example, trying to gain entry into the enterprise. I understand that. But there is no reasonable view of the evidence in this case that anybody

committed any acts in an attempt to gain entry into the so-called Courtlandt Avenue Crew. The government's theory has been consistent throughout and not a single witness ever testified that you could gain — that any of these acts were committed in order to get into the group. They were all committed by — allegedly by members of the group. So I don't think that that works as an avenue for suggesting that you could be not guilty of the RICO but guilty of the substantive acts.

Now as I said, this occurred to me last night for the first time, unfortunately. I haven't had a chance to research it, but it seems to me that I wanted to put that on the record because I think that there might be a problem here in terms of how the jury considers these counts and, in particular, the question of the substantive RICO count and the substantive acts.

THE COURT: Well, obviously I want to think about what you're saying, but what do you propose?

MR. MIEDEL: Well, for one, I propose that because there's no reasonable view of the evidence that anybody committed any acts in order to gain entry into the enterprise, that language should be struck from wherever it occurs in the jury instructions; and secondly, I think — and again, I'll have to think about this more too, but — I think the jury probably should be instructed that it cannot find Mr. Pierce,

at least, guilty of Count Three, or Count Four, murder of Jason Correa in aid of racketeering, unless it first finds him guilty of Count One, and the same thing for I believe it's Count Ten, attempted murder in aid of racketeering, that Count One serves essentially as the prerequisite for those substantive counts.

MS. HELLER: Your Honor, just briefly, it's our view that that's a completely incorrect statement of the law. The elements of the substantive crimes do not require by any means proof that a defendant is a member of — is guilty of a racketeering offense, a substantive racketeering offense. We charge them alone all the time in this courthouse, and that's permissible. So they don't need to be contingent. It's just not the law.

And the way that the verdict form is structured is actually totally perfect -- it's perfect, and I think it obviates the need for any changes because the substantive crimes are first and they can be evaluated on their own, and then it makes clear that they can't find Mr. Pierce guilty of the -- of Count One unless they find him guilty of two racketeering acts, and that is the law, of course, and that is the way the verdict form is structured. But Mr. Miedel is arguing for the reverse, but that's not the law, and I understand that he hasn't had a chance to research it, but I believe if he does, he'll find that that's not the law. And that's certainly our position.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MIEDEL: Well, your Honor, just briefly, I'm just looking at your jury instruction on page 84, which is the instruction for the third element of murder in aid of racketeering, purpose of the murder, and it says that the jury has to consider whether the act was done for the purpose of gaining entrance to, maintaining a position in, or increasing a position in the enterprise, or in consideration for a receipt of money. It's illogical. Obviously you can't -- I mean, assuming that the jury doesn't find the act was done to gain entrance into, and then it would make sense that a person is not a member of the enterprise, but both of the other ones, maintain a position in and increasing -- or increasing a position in the enterprise, requires that you are a member or an associate of the enterprise, which is a requirement of the RICO charge. I don't see how you could be possibly guilty of that count without being a member or associate of the enterprise.

MS. HELLER: Your Honor, you can be legally guilty of a substantive racketeering crime, such as a murder in aid of racketeering, without being legally guilty of the crime charged in Count One. Again, we charge that all the time. People who we don't have two predicate acts against but we know they did a murder in aid of racketeering but we don't have a second act, we do that all the time. It's legally permissible.

And in terms of the gaining entry point, we think that

should absolutely stay. Maybe it's not the case as to Mr. Pierce, but there's an argument to be made that Mr. Colon committed the murder of Alston in order to gain entry to the enterprise and curry favor with Mr. Harrison because it was committed so soon after his release from prison. So we oppose any removal of that language as well.

THE COURT: All right. We'll obviously have to continue to consider this issue.

Any issues relating to the government's closing?

MR. BECKER: Yes, your Honor. And I advised

Mr. Gosnell of this issue. It concerns the government's

demonstrative evidence that they gave notice of last night

regarding drug quantities, and I don't know if the court has

seen that, but --

THE COURT: I have.

MR. BECKER: All right. I don't know if it should be marked as an exhibit at this point, but I object to it, and I object to it for the following reasons: This exhibit is, of course -- or this demonstrative -- demonstrative is, of course, sought to be used by the government to demonstrate that at least 280 grams of cocaine base or crack were distributed during the course of the conspiracy, 280 grams of course being the number to get the government to the (b)(1)(A) drug quantity minimum, and what this demonstrative purports to say, or says, is that one dealer alone, an unknown dealer, not identified,

would have sold at least 280 grams of crack cocaine in no more than four months and in as little as two months, and it does so by first suggesting the amount of cocaine that could be found in one bag as either .1 grams or .05 grams, multiplying that by 50 bags, suggesting 50 bags a day, multiplying that by 30 days, and just extrapolating to a period sufficient to get to 280 grams.

The reason this is objectionable, your Honor, is, I don't believe there's any evidence in this case from one dealer that he sold 50 bags of crack cocaine every day for 30 days or, quite frankly, for 120 days, because 30 days would be one month, but to get to 280 grams under the .05 grams scenario, it would be four months. So you have to have testimony from one witness that he sold 50 bags a day every day for four months. It just -- I just don't believe there is such a witness that testified to that.

What the government has done here, I suggest, your

Honor, is — and perhaps that's why the demonstrative just says

one dealer without identifying who. What the government has

done here is, there is evidence in the record that people said

they sold seven days a week, and that was, of course,

challenged on cross, but there's certainly not evidence about

quantity like that. The only evidence in this record that I'm

aware of regarding quantity — and by quantity, I mean how much

cocaine would be found in a single bag — was the analyst

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

She was the one who I handed the calculator to. Osorio. analyzed or weighed what was in the -- what was in 22 bags, and after doing the math, I think that she said it came out to .06 grams per bag, .06, I believe -- I think it was .0622. rounded it down to .06. So based on one analyst's weighing 22 bags of cocaine, the government is using that to extrapolate to the entirety of this conspiracy and saying that: It's really very easy, ladies and gentlemen, for you to find 280 grams. All you have to do is this simple math. And if the government could support all of that with evidence in the record, then the demonstrative might be appropriate, but I submit that the evidence is not in the record. It's argument. extrapolation. And if it's argument, it shouldn't be a demonstrative. A demonstrative is designed to make the evidence clearer, not to present an argument, your Honor.

And finally, the government's choice of either .1 grams or .05 grams also I think is not supported by the record because, as I say, the only evidence in the record as to weight is .05 -- .06 grams per bag, and that's only with respect to 22 bags.

So this is a critical issue because it goes to a ten-year mandatory minimum, and the government is trying, through this demonstrative, to get there really by taking a shortcut and saying: Just do some simple math. It's very prejudicial, it's not probative, and it's not an appropriate

demonstrative, so I object.

MR. FEE: Your Honor, it is argument, and it sounds to me like the argument is that there's not evidence in the record to support this argument. There is, and these are very conservative estimates. There was testimony from Chemist Osorio. If you recall, that was the testimony where there was this first test, the drugs were processed, and then she did a second test. And then she said it's .06, after something was processed. So the .05 estimate is extremely conservative, so that's even after something was processed.

And the point -- Anthony Crocker, a prolific crack dealer, he gave an estimate. He said it was .2 grams, he believed, in each bag of crack. We took a very conservative view of that. We put .1 grams of crack in each dime bag, between .1 and .05. There's evidence to support higher amounts in the record.

As far as the frequency, the amount they sold every day, it's in the record. I don't have the cites right in front of me. Devin Parsons testified he got a G pack every two or three days, he said. That's a hundred bags of crack cocaine. Anthony Crocker said he would sell between 32 to a hundred bags in a few hours, and he also testified seven days a week, 24 hours a day, he was available to sell. Aubrey Pemberton also talked about selling 32 bags in an hour or two. There's evidence in the record. This is argument. They're in fact

conservative views of the evidence, and that's why we put them there. So I think it is appropriate at this point.

MR. BECKER: Your Honor, with respect to what Mr. Fee just said, the witness who said that he estimated .2 grams per bag, the court may recall, acknowledged on cross-examination it was a guess, he didn't know how many grams were in an ounce, he didn't know about the --

THE COURT: That all goes to weight. I remember the testimony of the cooperator who is a human scale.

MR. BECKER: Yes, your Honor. It goes to weight. And the government can argue what it wishes to argue, but to put it in a demonstrative like this to say this is — this is what we have in this case, we simply don't, your Honor. We don't have anybody saying that he sold 50 bags a day every day from four months. No one said that, Judge. If someone said it, it would be one thing. What they said was there were days where I sold a lot, sometimes it took me a week to sell 30 bags. It wasn't — it wasn't what this demonstrative says it was.

THE COURT: All right. Your application to exclude the government from showing this demonstrative is denied.

MR. BECKER: Very well, your Honor. Two other issues. I don't know that they need to be resolved right now, but I just want to put it on the record so it's clear.

Actually one other issue. The superseding indictment, the most recently redacted version of the superseding

indictment appears to have a paragraph in it that was previously stricken by order of the court and seems to have found its way back in. I've conferred with the government. I think we're in agreement on this. It doesn't have to be taken up before summations. I don't think it's going to be an issue at all, but I just wanted to point that out. We'll deal with that as appropriate.

THE COURT: Fine.

MR. DINNERSTEIN: Your Honor, I just have a couple of things that are cosmetic in terms of the indictment. Page 90 of the -- of the charge says "the murder of a member of the Maria Lopez crew." I believe it should say "the murder of members," which is what the indictment says.

And also, on page 109, as to the fourth element, line 14, it says -- talks about Count Eleven, which is the conspiracy to -- I guess to murder people of the Maria Lopez crew. It says "killing." It obviously should say "shooting."

THE COURT: All right. Quite frankly, are there any issues that are going to directly impact on summations?

MR. DINNERSTEIN: That was, your Honor, because I want to make reference to those particular items. That's why I brought it up now.

THE COURT: Thank you. Any objection? Any objection to Mr. Dinnerstein's suggested modifications in the redacted indictment --

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. HELLER: We don't have any objection --1 2 THE COURT: -- or the charge? 3 MS. HELLER: We'll double-check at lunch, but -- and 4 let anyone know if there's any change to that, but we don't 5 anticipate any objection. THE COURT: All right. Now, Mr. Fee, you're going to 6 7 present the closing argument for the government? 8 MR. FEE: That's correct, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Okay. I remind you that you'll be

afforded two hours. I'll ask you gently to begin to conclude your summation when you have ten minutes left, and then I'll give you a one-minute warning.

> MR. FEE: Thank you.

THE COURT: The jury is all here. I want to advise counsel that juror number 7 was hospitalized over the weekend and was just released from the hospital yesterday. Nevertheless, she's here today and ready to go. However, if she needs a break during summations, she's going to raise her hand and I'm going to promptly interrupt whoever is arguing, and I will give you a little extra time because of that interruption. If she doesn't raise her hand and just runs out of the courtroom, you'll understand that it's more exigent, and we'll deal with it. So don't be alarmed that a juror is reacting to what a party is saying in the case.

MR. DINNERSTEIN: Your Honor, have you had any

discussion with her about her willingness to continue to sit in the case in view of the health problems?

THE COURT: No. No, I have not, because she simply sent an e-mail advising, wanting to bring it to our attention, and ensuring us that she intended to be here.

MR. DINNERSTEIN: Do you think it's appropriate for you to have a conversation with her?

THE COURT: I certainly can if the parties desire that.

MR. BECKER: Your Honor, my only question would be, I suppose, whether or not whatever the affliction was that led her to be hospitalized has somehow affected her ability to concentrate or focus or deliberate. The obvious concerns that all of us would have. Other —— I do think it might be appropriate to make that inquiry.

MR. MIEDEL: Your Honor, I agree with that.

THE COURT: Let me read the e-mail that my deputy received from her.

"Hello, Wayne. I wanted to inform you that I became ill Thursday morning with acute diverticulitis and was hospitalized from Friday afternoon until noon yesterday to receive IV antibiotics. My doctor's given me a note to excuse me from jury duty, but I would like to try and remain on the case, and I expect to be at the court later this morning. I felt I should report my status to you in case a complication

were to arise. Sincerely," juror number 7.

It strikes me that in view of this e-mail, and the fact that she's here and ready to go, does not require further inquiry from the court at this time. I instructed my deputy to let her know if for any reason she needed to take a break that she should simply raise her hand or, if it's more exigent, she should just run into the jury room and we'll deal with it.

Now given this, does any counsel still believe that I should conduct a further voir dire?

MR. ARAVIND: Not from the government, your Honor.

MR. DINNERSTEIN: I think -- I think the way you'll handle it will be appropriate.

MR. MIEDEL: Your Honor, I think that in light of the e-mail, I particularly feel it's not necessary at this point, but if she does experience some sort of distress or something --

THE COURT: No question about it, okay?

MR. MIEDEL: Okay.

THE COURT: A trial, even in closing arguments, continues to be a dynamic event.

Also, so that we avoid the problem of interrupting someone's summation for lunch, I provided menus to the jurors this morning. Their lunch will be provided to them in the jury room so that we can take a somewhat abbreviated lunch break.

And therefore we'll hear the government's summation first, then

(In open court; jury present)

THE COURT: Well good morning, members of the jury.

Thank you for your punctuality. Thank you for all being here.

I trust that you've all had a relaxing, safe Thanksgiving holiday.

We're going to return now to one of the concluding phases in any trial, closing arguments. Closing arguments are just that, they are argument by counsel about what counsel believes has been proven or not proven in the course of the trial. You're going to hear first from the government, and as I explained to you a week ago, the government also gets the last word, because the burden of proof in a criminal case is always on the government to prove a defendant guilty by competent evidence and beyond a reasonable doubt. That burden never shifts to a defendant.

You'll hear first from the prosecutors for approximately two hours. And then we will take an abbreviated luncheon recess. I trust that you've all made your lunch decisions. And then we will hear two closing arguments in the afternoon from defense counsel. So, that's what lies ahead today.

I ask at this time that you give your undivided attention to Assistant United States Attorney Adam Fee as he delivers his closing argument on behalf of the government.

MR. FEE: Thank you, your Honor.

1 2

At the beginning of this trial, you heard the opening statements of defense counsel. They told you that you would learn that Joshua Meregildo was a man with a good jump shot who wasn't involved in drugs and violence. That you would learn that Melvin Colon was just a fan of some rap group called the Get Fresh Crew, and that he never sold drugs or committed any shootings. That you would learn that Earl Pierce was an older man with no real connection to the real bad guys in this case. That you would learn that Nolbert Miranda was just a solo drug dealer who kept to himself on Courtlandt Avenue.

All of those statements were really forms of arguments. These defense attorneys were and they still are arguing that the evidence in this case simply would not allow these defendants to be revealed for the criminals that they really, truly are.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, at this time you have seen a tremendous amount of evidence in this case. Has anything you've seen during this trial, anything at all, really supported the suggestion that Joshua Meregildo was only interested in basketball while out on Courtlandt Avenue in 2010 and 2011? Or that Melvin Colon thought GFC was just about wearing nice clothes and impressing girls? Or that Earl Pierce had nothing to do with the drug trade on Courtlandt Avenue? Or that Nolbert Miranda was a completely independent drug dealer? Of course not. These men are drug dealers or murderers or

CBQ3MER2

Summation - Mr. Fee

both, and they worked together to commit crimes, and that's exactly what the evidence in this case showed.

Now, we're almost at the end of this case, and at this point one thing should be clear to you. And that is that the evidence in this case showed beyond a reasonable doubt that each of these four defendants are guilty of the crimes charged.

I'm not going to waste your time today -- it wouldn't be even be possible -- to go through all of the evidence and all the testimony you've heard, but I'm going to spend time talking about some of the evidence today just to highlight how it makes clear that these four defendants are absolutely guilty of the crimes charged.

Before I do that, there's a few things we need to do.

First I want to step back and give you a bird's eye view of some of the major events you have a heard about in this case.

Second, I want to very briefly talk about how you know the witnesses' testimony in this case is true, because it interlocks with the evidence and other testimony. Third, I want to talk about the charges and evidence in some detail.

And throughout this summation what I am going to do is talk about how some of the arguments and theories you heard from defense counsel and arguments I expect you will hear don't make sense and you should reject it.

The government has the burden at every stage of this case to prove the defendants guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

We embrace that burden. And we've met it here. But when defense counsel makes arguments in openings, summations, or during the questioning of witnesses suggests arguments to you, the government has an obligation and a right to respond. You have an obligation to scrutinize those arguments.

Summation - Mr. Fee

So first, the bird's eye view of this case. You've heard a lot of evidence in this case. You don't need me or anyone else to tell you that. You've been here for eight weeks. It's been a long ride. So really the first thing I want to do again is pull back and run through the major events you heard about during this trial.

As you know, this case is about the Courtlandt Avenue crew. That's what it's called in the indictment, but it never had just one name on the streets. At its core, at its essence, this crew is made up of two parts. First, it was made up of grown men of Courtlandt Avenue. Older, more experienced drug dealers. Men like T-Money, Terry Harrison. Men like Earl Pierce, and Nolbert Miranda. These older men supplied drugs to young dealers on Courtlandt Avenue, took back profit from the drug sales, and sometimes got involved in firearms or violence when the business was threatened.

The second piece of the Courtlandt Avenue crew was the gang made up of younger men on Courtlandt Avenue. This was GFC, then it became OGFC or OG as you heard. First the GFC gang members were the foot soldiers of the crew. They did the

Summation - Mr. Fee

hand-to-hand deals on street of drugs, they committed shootings at rival gang members, and sometimes they committed murders at the request of the older men in this crew.

Two of those GFC members, these men, Joshua Meregildo and Melvin Colon, grew out of GFC. They started their own gang you heard about, this OGFC. These two men also became leaders of the crew as a whole. This whole case as you've heard started with Terry Harrison. T-Money. T-Money got out of jail in 2010 and saw an opportunity. The federal government had just arrested dozens of older men who had sold drugs in that area around Courtlandt Avenue just before T-Money got out of jail. T-Money tried to fill that void by selling drugs on Courtlandt Avenue. To do so he enlisted a group young men from the Jackson and Melrose Projects to help him sell drugs. This was GFC. God's Favorite Children. You heard about what GFC was and what it became under T-Money.

And the drug business on Courtlandt Avenue flourished. The crew was literally selling crack and marijuana 24/7. Earl Pierce and Nolbert Miranda became critical members of this booming drug business. Both of these men sold crack on the street side by side with the GFC members and with T-Money. And Miranda, you heard, supplied the GFC members with crack cocaine to help keep the crew's drug business humming along.

With this booming drug business the crew began to bump up against other dealers in the neighborhood. You heard about

Summation - Mr. Fee

these rivals, O, Luchie, older more experienced dealers in the area, and soon things turned violent in and around Courtlandt Avenue.

Early in the summer of 2010 you heard somebody tried to kill T-Money, failed. And after that the crew became obsessed with eliminating threats to the crew, to its drug business, to T-Money. Eventually there were three murders committed in that summer that you've heard a lot about. First, on July 25 of 2010, Earl Pierce and T-Money killed Jason Correa because he was close with 0, one of the drug rivals. Second, on July 30 and 31 of 2010, Joshua Meregildo and others stalked and killed Carrel Ogarro because they thought Carrel was snitching. August 27, 2010, the third murder, Colon shot and killed Delquan Alston because he was viewed as a threat to the health of the crew's drug business.

This same summer you also heard about the gang rivalry between the crew and a wild gang, the Young Gunners, and the YG gang, which turned violent, kept going right through September 2011.

That's Melvin Colon's hand. YGK. That's YG Killa, as he said, he paved the way for that.

Then everything changed for the crew going back to 2010, in September, when T-Money was killed just outside 681 Courtlandt Avenue. The crew wanted revenge. You heard what they did just a few days after, Meregildo and Pierce went after

Summation - Mr. Fee

Luchie's crew at the 321 building. They shot one of Luchie's people several times because they thought Luchie was responsible for T-Money's death. That was the shooting of Tarean Joseph by Pierce and Meregildo.

After T-Money's death, Colon became the man on Courtlandt Avenue for crack and for guns. The violence kept going as well. All the way up to September 2011, when Jing Bao Jiang, the man you saw in this courtroom, was shot.

Here we are in this courtroom, and in a moment we are going to drill down and talk about how everything I just told you about happened just the way I described based on the evidence you saw here.

First I want to briefly touch on a theme you are going to hear from me over and over again during this summation.

That's how the testimony of the witnesses in this case is supported by other witnesses' testimony and the physical evidence, the forensic evidence, and your common sense. When testimony interlocks with other witnesses' testimony, and other evidence, like forensic, physical, ballistics evidence, it's called corroboration, and it helps you to know that those witnesses are absolutely telling you the truth.

So let's talk about the charges in this case and how the evidence you saw makes clear that these four defendants are absolutely guilty. I am going to talk about it in three sections. First the drug charges, that was at the core of what

Summation - Mr. Fee

this crew did; second, the gun charges; and the violence that they used these guns to commit, some of these defendants.

So first, the drug conspiracy charge. There is two things I expect Judge Pauley is going to tell you the government has to prove for this charge. First, that a conspiracy existed to distribute crack cocaine and marijuana. Second, that each of the defendants was a member of that drug conspiracy.

Now, there is a mountain of evidence in this case that shows beyond a reasonable doubt that this crew ran a large-scale drug operation on Courtlandt Avenue in 2010 and 2011, and that each of these four defendants was part of it. So I am going to review only some of that evidence today.

Let's talk first about Joshua Meregildo. You heard over and over again from cooperating witnesses that Joshua Meregildo sold marijuana for T-Money in 2010. Aubrey Pemberton bought marijuana from Meregildo, so did Anthony Crocker, Carlos Villafranco, Devin Parsons. And Pemberton, Crocker, and Villafranco also saw with their own eyes, they told you, T-Money supplying Meregildo with marijuana to sell to others.

You also know that Meregildo had a role in the crack conspiracy on Courtlandt Avenue even before T-Money died.

Crocker told that you when T-Money wasn't available, T-Money told Crocker to go to Meregildo to get crack and to give his drug profits he made from selling T-Money's drugs back to

Meregildo. So it make sense that after T-Money died, it was Meregildo who really took over the drug trade for this crew.

Summation - Mr. Fee

Very soon after T-Money was shot, Meregildo summoned Crocker to that meeting in that Dodge Charger that Crocker told you about. Here's what he said Meregildo told him: He was telling me he's gonna continue to give me drugs, it's gonna be the same thing T-Money was doing. The split is going to be 60/40. He keeps 60, I keep 40, and then he asks do I feel safe where I'm at, do I need any guns in my apartment. This was just after T-Money's death. Crocker was nearby T-Money when he died. It's clear that Meregildo was announcing to Crocker he's taking over T-Money's role in this drug conspiracy.

That's exactly what happened. You heard that over and over again. Crocker got crack from Meregildo, he sold it to the same customers he used to sell for when T-Money was alive. He had the same profit split that he had with T-Money.

Pemberton told you the same thing. Corroborated

Crocker in important details. Pemberton told you that a day or

two after T-Money died, Meregildo summoned Pemberton to a

meeting and told him again we going to keep getting money.

That day Meregildo gave Pemberton dozens of bags of crack, and

he gave Pemberton more crack on other days. Pemberton took

those drugs, sold them to the same customers on Courtlandt

Avenue that he sold to when T-Money was alive, and had the same

split of the profits that he had with T-Money. This time, with

Joshua Meregildo.

That's amazing evidence of Meregildo's participation in this drug conspiracy, and it's so clearly truthful because even though Crocker and Pemberton are talking about different

meetings at different times, they talk about Joshua Meregildo

doing basically the same thing.

Another way you know Meregildo was participating in this drug conspiracy is his own words. You remember those oaths that he had written and distributed to OGFC members? And there is a portion of it, OGFC oath, written in his own hand. Then he says in there, he pledges to get — getting money by all means.

That's basically what he told Crocker and Pemberton. You know how Joshua Meregildo and the crew got money. By selling drugs.

So the line of leadership for this drug conspiracy went from T-Money to Meregildo. After Meregildo was arrested by the ATF on bank robbery charges, it was Melvin Colon who took control of this drug conspiracy. The first way you know that Colon sold drugs with other Courtlandt Avenue crew members is the incredibly detailed testimony you heard from the cooperating witnesses in this case. Crocker and Pemberton, again, two very active crack dealers you heard from. They told you about Colon after T-Money's death supplying crack to crew members. They talked about Colon bagging crack in his own

CBQ3MER2

bedroom and in his apartment on 161st Street, and how he set up Crocker with his own supplier in that building, and how Colon supplied several other crew members with crack.

Summation - Mr. Fee

You also know that Melvin Colon was involved in this drug conspiracy from his own words. And the photographs you've seen at this trial. I'm talking about Colon's own words where he makes clear he is engaged in the business of dealing drugs. I'll show you some of those Facebook posts you saw from Colon's account. September 2011: I'm trying to see the man for like 600 grams.

September 2011 again: About to play the strip. I got the key to Courtlandt. Me and my N words got it on lock.

Money, drugs and bitches is all part of the game.

I don't need to explain what these men or go through the dozens of other examples because you've seen them, some of them. But it's clear Colon is talking about dealing drugs on Courtlandt Avenue with this crew. Look at this last one we have for you. Free the dick heads Capito and 14 more money for me LOL.

That's exactly right. Capito is Javon Jones, another GFC member you heard about. 14, that's Anthony Crocker, that's his nickname. If they got out of jail, Colon would make more money. Because they were selling for Colon out on Courtlandt Avenue. So that's not just empty words. That's not bragging by Colon. That's exactly how he was making money: Supplying

Summation - Mr. Fee

CBQ3MER2

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

crack cocaine to dealers in this crew and getting a cut of those profits back. The pictures that you saw, they tell the same story that you heard from the witnesses. Colon worked with this crew on Courtlandt Avenue to sell drugs.

Talk about Earl Pierce. Earl Pierce sold drugs, specifically crack, on Courtlandt Avenue. It's straightforward. You heard that over and over again from witnesses like Crocker, Villafranco, Folks. And Folks, Bernard Folks, saw Pierce bagging up crack that summer in the apartment of another GFC member, Enrique Brito. Folks was also right there when Pierce and T-Money split up crack that they bought together to sell on Courtlandt Avenue. Here's what Folks said: I used to be at Ski Box house at a point when after me and T-Money just came from picking up product. We used to go in the house. They -- talking about Pierce and T-Money -- would put it on the table, split it up between both of them, and they go on about they business after that until the next shipment.

There is no better example of what this drug conspiracy charge is all about then the image of Pierce and T-Money sitting at Pierce's table and splitting up the crack they bought together to then distribute to other sellers on Courtlandt Avenue.

Devin Parsons confirmed what you already heard from these other witnesses, that Pierce was T-Money's partner in this drug trade. Pierce -- Parsons told you that T-Money would

Summation - Mr. Fee

1

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

25

There is absolutely no serious dispute at this 24 point that Miranda sold crack to make money. That he sold

crack on Courtlandt Avenue in and around the Jackson and

tell Parsons if he wasn't around, go to Pierce to give back the profits from the drugs you sold for T-Money.

What absolutely confirms that Pierce was a member of this drug conspiracy, the testimony of Maria Ortiz. You heard that she lived on Courtlandt Avenue in her sister's apartment and her sister dated Pierce. Maria Ortiz did not have any kind of criminal relationship with T-Money, Pierce, or Miranda. What did Maria Ortiz tell you about Pierce? That in the summer of 2010, she saw Pierce cutting up crack in that apartment and splitting it into bags. She saw Pierce pull a bag of crack out of his rear and say he was going outside to sell it. Maria Ortiz told that you almost every time she was around Pierce in the summer of 2010, he was talking about making drug sales.

And who did Maria Ortiz actually see Pierce bringing in and out of that apartment at 681 Courtlandt? T-Money, Levi Guzman, Miranda, another GFC member called 12. That was Hassen Brito. Members of the Courtlandt Avenue crew. In fact, on multiple occasions that summer, she told you Maria Ortiz saw Pierce and T-Money dividing up large amounts of cash between them in that apartment.

Talk about Miranda. Many of these witnesses knew him

Summation - Mr. Fee

Melrose Projects. And that he sold crack in that area for quite some time before his arrest. No one is going to come in this courtroom and seriously dispute those facts.

The issue I expect Miranda is going to dispute is whether he sold drugs with this crew, as a member of this drug conspiracy. He absolutely did, and the evidence really makes that clear.

The first reason you know that Miranda was a member of this drug conspiracy is again what you heard from the members of this crew who sold side by side with Miranda. Those witnesses who were former GFC members told you the same thing. That they frequently saw Miranda selling crack on Courtlandt Avenue, side by side with other members of the crew.

There is overwhelming physical evidence that Miranda was actually selling crack on Courtlandt Avenue that summer.

Two times NYPD caught him with drugs or paraphernalia. This is from June of 2010, these baggies he was caught with. And this is from September, these empty baggies he was caught with,

Nolbert Miranda, in and around the Jackson and Melrose

Projects. The officer who seized these, you remember,

estimated there were about a thousand little baggies in here.

You heard from witness after witness after witness about Miranda actually supplying crack to members of this crew who sold on Courtlandt Avenue. Pemberton went to Miranda in 2010 for crack, again and again, so he could sell it on

Summation - Mr. Fee

Courtlandt to the crew's customers. Pemberton also saw Miranda supply other crew members with crack that summer. Crocker also told you he got double ups -- remember that word that he and Pemberton used -- from Miranda, just like Pemberton, so he could maintain a steady flow of crack and cash for the crew's customers on Courtlandt. Parsons, he regularly split, he told you, customers with Miranda. Half of the drugs filled by Parsons, half the drugs filled by Miranda.

Does any of this evidence even remotely support the suggestion that Miranda was a completely independent drug dealer on Courtlandt Avenue? Of course not. And again, Maria Ortiz confirms what these other witnesses told you. She saw Miranda with T-Money, Pierce, and other crew members in the summer of 2010, and heard Miranda talk about selling crack.

Then after his arrest in this case, Miranda admitted what he did to make money. He told Agent Castillo that he sold crack, that he sold crack in the Courtlandt Avenue area for many years, that he knew T-Money. Miranda also told Agent Castillo he was willing to plead guilty to 10 years. Miranda also told Agent Castillo he sold for himself. And that lines up actually with what you've learned in this case. Miranda is the guy who goes in on a crack purchase with T-Money. He doesn't buy from T-Money.

MR. BECKER: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. FEE: Miranda sold for himself in the same way that T-Money sold for himself. He used the crew's dealers to make money. The fact that T-Money and Miranda sometimes disagreed about certain things does not mean they were not both part of the same conspiracy. Jeter and A-Rod don't always get along, but they both still play for the Yankees. Similarly here, there is no legal requirement that all the participants of the conspiracy get along or that they agree on all of the ins and outs of the details of the conspiracy.

Miranda, you learned, was in fact essential to the health of this drug conspiracy on Courtlandt Avenue. From all the evidence you heard in this case, before T-Money died, September 2010, there were only two sources of supply for this 24/7 crack market on Courtlandt Avenue. T-Money and Nolbert Miranda. That's it.

I expect that Miranda and Pierce's attorneys may argue that those two defendants might have sold drugs on a few occasions, but did not conspire with the rest of the crew, and really you should not spend much time on that argument before you completely reject it. You have overwhelming evidence in this case that both Pierce and Miranda worked with members of this crew in 2010 to sell crack. Given everything that we just discussed about this evidence, how can Pierce or Miranda seriously dispute that they were working with the rest of this crew in this drug conspiracy? In no aspect of your ordinary

Summation - Mr. Fee

lives would you accept such a claim.

easy to digest. Think about going to see a music show. A band with a few people playing guitars, a drummer with a big drum set. Maybe some horn players, backup singers, a lead singer. You watch the show and they are playing some pretty good music. The drummer is keeping time, the guitar players get a few solos, the backup singers are doing their moves; it all sounds pretty good to you. After the show ends, if someone came to you and told you, hey, you know that drummer, he was not playing music with the rest of that group. He just happened to be practicing his drums on the stage at the same time that all those other folks, the singer, the horn players, the guitar players, just happened to show up. I'm telling you that drummer was not even with those other musicians. They just all happened to be at the same place at the same time.

Ladies and gentlemen, you would say that's ridiculous, that's absolutely ridiculous. Of course the drummer was playing in the band. He was keeping time with the songs, he was hitting the bass drum on the right notes, he was looking at the other band members and he was smiling. Everything I saw and heard made absolutely clear that that drummer was a part of the group.

And it is the same thing here. Pierce and Miranda were part of the crew for this drug conspiracy, and everything

Summation - Mr. Fee

they did and saw that you learned about in this trial made that absolutely clear.

On top of that, you know who did not sell with T-Money and GFC. The crew's rivals. The YGs gang. O's people. Luchie's people. There is not one piece of evidence in this case, not one line of testimony that any of those groups ever sold where the crew was selling at the same time. They would have been shot if they tried to sell crack there. But men like Pierce and Miranda, on the other hand, were on Courtlandt, selling side by side with T-Money and GFC. Because this was one crew working together in one drug conspiracy.

Briefly before I turn to the other charges, I want to briefly talk about the amount of drugs that were sold during this conspiracy, and I expect Judge Pauley is going to tell you if you find the defendants guilty of being involved in this conspiracy, you're going to be asked whether the conspiracy involved more than 280 grams of crack cocaine over the entire life of the conspiracy.

This is an easy question, a simple question. You heard Crocker estimate that the dime bags of crack he used to sell each had about .2 or so grams of crack in each bag. You also heard from a chemist, Ms. Osorio. She talked about a sample of drugs she had which was processed and had about .05 or 6 grams of crack in each bag. That's after processing, but she said it was around that amount. So, you know, let's take

CBQ3MER2

Summation - Mr. Fee

the estimate between .2 and .05 grams in each dime bag. This will be the only math I do. I promise. So think about that. Even if Miranda or Pierce or Pemberton or Parsons or whoever only sold about 50 bags a day, at that extremely low estimate of .05 grams per bag, that adds up to about 75 grams per month. That's only for a single crack dealer working one month in this conspiracy. This went on for about 18 months from September --excuse me, from the spring of 2010 through September of 2011. So based on this low estimate, one dealer for this crew would have sold 1,350 grams of crack during those 18 months. That's based off of what could have been a bad day of sales for someone like Miranda or Crocker, Parsons. Because you heard from Pemberton, Crocker and Parsons they sometimes sold a hundred bags in a day, 32 bags in a couple of hours.

Again, using the lowest possible estimate for the weight of crack in the dime bag, just one single dealer sold that amount. So you'd only need four dealers working one month to sell 280 grams of crack.

Here's some of that same math. Using that .05 system for one dealer, take them less than four months. And just using a slightly higher estimate, closer to Crocker's 280 grams, in less than two months. Again, one dealer, and you know there were many, many dealers involved in this crew.

The point, ladies and gentlemen, is that this drug conspiracy involved hundreds and hundreds of grams of crack

being sold every month. So the question about quantity really should not take much of your time.

So the drug trade was the engine that drove this crew, but the guns, all these guns they had were absolutely key for this group to thrive. You recall Aubrey Pemberton demonstrating the original symbol for GFC. The one that Colon did with Pemberton the very first time they met. It was the two guns up symbol. You saw it in photos as well.

Some of these crew members had tattoos reflecting guns. Nolbert Miranda. Guns and baggies.

And ladies and gentlemen, here are all the guns recovered from this crew. These are just the ones — they're falling apart. These are just the ones recovered by the ATF and the NYPD. And parts of the guns. You know they had more guns than just what is recovered and what's falling apart on that table, because you saw in pictures some of these other guns.

The first gun charge I want to address relates to all four of these defendants, and it is about them possessing using or carrying guns in connection with the charged drug conspiracy. All of the witnesses who previously were members of the crew, Folks, Parsons, Pemberton, Villafranco, Crocker, they told you about guns kept in crew members' apartments, in mailboxes, in the lobbies of buildings in the Jackson and Melrose Houses, and on the block itself. Right there on

Courtlandt Avenue, put in pizza boxes, kept in the grass, tucked behind the wheels of cars that were parked on the avenue. All of these witnesses also told you why these guns were kept on the block in 2010 and 2011. To protect the crew's territory on Courtlandt Avenue from rival gangs and rival drug dealers. Folks told you about this. The reason he said was to protect us from our beefs, our problems with other neighborhoods and other crews.

Summation - Mr. Fee

You also learned that the entire crew had access to these guns. You know that because they actually went and carried and used the guns frequently. After T-Money's death, Meregildo took control of these guns. Remember the meeting in the car with Crocker, Meregildo asked him do you need a gun. Do you feel safe. Meregildo had control of the guns, and control of the crew's members after T-Money died. And then Colon was the man who kept the supply of guns going for the crew. You heard about this from several cooperating witnesses. Melvin Colon had an arsenal of weapons kept at his apartment at 161st Street, in addition to the drugs he kept there.

Folks, Pemberton, Crocker, they didn't just see these guns at Colon's apartment once or twice. In 2011, a steady supply of guns was a constant at Colon's apartment. You needed a gun, go to Melly's.

You also heard from these witnesses about how Colon kept buying more guns to keep up the supply for the crew. And

remember, he would ask for money sometimes to get reimbursed for the guns.

So what about Earl Pierce and guns. Now, one remarkable theme in the evidence in this case, something that came up from witness after witness talking about entirely different situations, was Earl Pierce and this gun. This silver and black .380. This was Pierce's gun, and there really should not be a serious dispute about that at this point.

Early in the summer of 2010, Crocker talked about this. Just after that failed attempt on T-Money's life, Crocker saw Pierce minutes after the assault out on Courtlandt Avenue carrying this gun. So you know Pierce had it at the ready. Parsons saw Pierce again with the silver and black .380 on several occasions, and told you that Pierce kept this gun inside of the mailboxes in the lobby of the 681 building where he stayed.

Let's look at where that 681 building is. You've seen this from the bigger map. Courtlandt Avenue is just next to that building where the crew dealt crack and marijuana 24/7, and where Pierce himself made crack sale after crack sale. So there really is no question, and common sense tells why you Pierce had that .380 in the summer of 2010. He kept it around in case he needed it while he was selling drugs on the strip.

For Miranda there is overwhelming evidence that he possessed and carried guns while dealing crack and that he

Summation - Mr. Fee

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

aided and abetted or helped other people carry guns in the summer of 2010. Parsons gave you amazing proof of this. the summer of 2010, Parsons was with Miranda on Courtlandt selling crack. Remember, Miranda asked Parsons to come down to a building at the Maria Lopez Houses. There, Miranda gave Parsons a silver 9-millimeter pistol with a black handle. Parsons told you it could hold 17 shots, he was told. Miranda told Parsons to take the gun back to Parsons' apartment which was in that 681 building, and a few hours later Nolbert Miranda came to Parson's apartment, took the gun, and went down to the second floor. And you know what was on the second floor of the 681 building, Earl Pierce's apartment. And in fact, Pierce ended up with Miranda's 9-millimeter pistol after that day. You know that because at some point after Parsons spoke with Pierce, Pierce told him he had PayDay's 9-millimeter. 9-millimeter that could hold 17 shots. The same gun that Parsons had carried for Miranda to the 681 building.

Miranda also left a qun at Pemberton's apartment and he told you about that. Pemberton described the gun as a silver and black 9-millimeter. The same description you've heard from witness after witness about the gun that was in Miranda's possession.

So this is more of the same conduct for Miranda. like he had Parsons carry the qun, he had another young GFC member store that 9-millimeter in Pemberton's apartment.

of the same.

In addition, after his arrest, Miranda admitted to possessing a gun on Courtlandt Avenue. Miranda told Folks in prison, Folks told you, that while he was out on Courtlandt he had a silver and black 9-millimeter gun. The same gun you heard described by witness after witness.

Using your common sense, you know why Miranda wanted to keep these guns close to Courtlandt Avenue. Because that's where Miranda sold crack, and that's where he supplied crack to members of this crew. Miranda lived somewhere else, you heard. But he kept his guns on Courtlandt because that's where he sold drugs.

There are several additional gun charges that relate to the different acts of violence in this case. Let's turn to those acts of violence now. As you've heard from some of these witnesses, the crew on Courtlandt Avenue was the central focus for many of these young people's lives. It was like their family, some of these witnesses said, especially when T-Money was alive. So in the summer of 2010, when the crew's rivals began to threaten the crew's drug territory and they tried to kill T-Money on that occasion, some of these defendants became obsessed with protecting the crew, its drug business, and its leader. This obsession led to the most serious, the most heinous crimes in this case. Assaults, attempted murders, and murder.

OB QUILLE

Let's talk about the murder of Jason Correa. Jason grew up and lived near the Jackson and Melrose Projects where the defendants' group operated. He was on the opposite side of the crew's war on its rivals. Maria Ortiz and Iris Perez told you how close Jason was with O, one of the rivals. Said they were like brothers.

On July 25 of 2010, when Earl Pierce's cousin brought Jason to 681 Courtlandt Avenue, again, in the heart of this crew's territory, Pierce and T-Money seized the opportunity to take out someone they viewed as a rival. You learned about Pierce's role in this vicious murder from multiple witnesses. First, Folks told you a little bit of background about this rivalry, talked about how O had told T-Money early in the summer of 2010 that T-Money could not sell in the area. Folks also told you about what Pierce did to help murder Jason Correa.

On July 25, Folks said he began the day as he often did that summer, selling drugs on Courtlandt Avenue. And you heard what that meant, moving up and down the block, in and around Courtlandt, sometimes hanging with other members of the crew. Servicing customers for drugs. And at some point, Pierce took T-Money aside, and Folks overheard part of that conversation. He overheard Pierce telling T-Money let him live, he's with my cousin. Let him live. My cousin's with him, let him live. You remember seeing the person on that

Summation - Mr. Fee

surveillance view who Folks identified as Pierce's cousin. And he was walking with Jason Correa into 681 just before Jason died. On the right, Pierce's cousin. On the left, Jason Correa. You see Pierce's cousin has the hand to his ear.

Folks said that after he heard this exchange, Pierce went into the 681 building, T-Money followed, and Folks and Pemberton went as well. In the lobby, Pierce spoke with T-Money again. And Folks overheard part of it again. Pierce told T-Money I am going to be waiting for you to finish. When you come out, I'm gonna be there.

That's exactly what Pierce did. Pierce was waiting for T-Money to shoot and kill Jason Correa, and he took the gun back after it happened.

Who else was in that lobby. Pemberton was there, and he told you about a separate exchange he had with T-Money and Pierce. And Pemberton was very candid with you. He told you that he thought they were going to do a robbery, and he wanted in on it. So he walked up to T-Money and said let me do it. And at that point Pierce stepped in, and here's what Pemberton heard him say. No. Pierce told T-Money. You wanted it, you do it.

So let's be clear what was happening just outside of 681 and in that lobby, Pierce and T-Money were planning the murder of Jason. And inside the lobby, Pierce made clear that he wanted T-Money to go forward with the murder. "You do it"

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

he told T-Money.

That's, again, exactly what happened. T-Money and Folks in that building went inside the stairwell. Pierce went up the opposite stairwell to wait by his apartment. T-Money let Pierce's cousin, the heavy-set guy we just saw, pass on through and then he stopped Jason. Then, T-Money pulled out this .380 qun. Pierce's qun. Next, T-Money shot Jason using this gun. First T-Money shot Jason in his chest, then in his stomach, and in each arm. After those four shots, T-Money and Folks stepped over Jason's body, started going up the stairs, towards where Pierce was waiting to get the gun. But when they heard as if it sounded like Jason had a breath of life in him, T-Money turned back around and shot Jason in the back.

And that's what Folks told you, and that's exactly what the autopsy and the crime scene photos show.

Then T-Money went up the stairs and he handed this gun back to Pierce. Pierce took the gun on the second floor right outside the apartment where he was staying. Maria Ortiz took you through the rest of the story at this point. All of her testimony is really incredibly damning against Pierce.

So that same day, Maria told you she was inside of the apartment on the second floor of 681. And only about 20 seconds after she heard the last shot outside her door, Pierce came back walking in the apartment. He was cool, he was calm, he was collected. Consider that for a moment. Think

Summation - Mr. Fee

about your everyday experiences. If you heard gunshots just outside the door where your family lived, would you be scared? Would you at least be worried? Would you ask if everyone was okay? Of course you would. But Pierce didn't, and he was calm because he knew exactly who fired those shot, and who was hit with those shots, because he was in on the murder.

Then some time later, after Pierce learned that Maria Ortiz was talking to the police, you heard her tell you that he threatened to kill her. Let me say that again. After Pierce learned that Maria Ortiz was talking to the police about Jason's murder, Pierce threatened to assault and to kill her if she kept snitching. That's a guilty conscience, and that's because Pierce is guilty of this murder.

I want to make a few quick points about some of the arguments I expect you are going to hear from Pierce's attorney about this. I expect they are going to make some point about the clocks on the surveillance videos not lining up perfectly with the minute with what you heard. I am not going to replay all those videos for you because we don't have time. Let me be clear about this. These surveillance videos absolutely corroborate the witnesses' testimony about the important events leading up to this murder. No one is going to be able to stand before you and seriously argue that the videos you saw do anything other than offer remarkable proof that Jason was brought to that building on that day by Pierce's cousin, that

CBQ3MER2

Summation - Mr. Fee

Pierce was inside of 681 that day, that Folks and T-Money and Pemberton were there, and that T-Money and Folks left, just as Folks said they did. (Continued on next page) 

Summation - Mr. Fee

MR. FEE: And this is in line with another argument I expect you're going to hear. That is that the testimony of Folks and Pemberton somehow differs on certain details and that means they're not telling the truth. Now you heard both their testimony and you can evaluate it for yourself, but the differences between their accounts really should — should give you confidence that they're just telling you what they each remember independently of one another and really their testimony and the other witnesses' testimony corroborates what Folks told you.

Pemberton told you what he learned after the shooting from T-Money. T-Money told him that they used a .380 gun to kill Jason. T-Money explained why they killed him, because Jason was O's people and it had to get done, T-Money told him.

Crocker. He learned directly from Pierce on the day of Jason's murder that T-Money -- that on the day of Jason's murder, according to Pierce, T-Money knew that Jason was in the building. Pierce admitted to Crocker that on that day he was waiting to take the gun from T-Money, and that after the murder, Pierce got the .380 from T-Money, and it was being snatched from Pierce's apartment, he told Crocker. That's exactly what happened, and when Crocker told you that, he could have only learned those details from Pierce himself.

Pierce also told Crocker that at some point after the murder, a young GFC member, 12, called Enrique Brito -- named

Summation - Mr. Fee

Enrique Brito, gave Pierce's .380 to the cops. That's why it's here today. And Pierce told Crocker that he was worried because this .380 had a body on it. That's what he told him after Jason's murder. And he thought 12, the person who handed it over, might tell on him.

Well, you know what happened. Pierce sits there as a defendant, and there's overwhelming evidence of his guilt in this case. So he was right to be concerned.

Now finally, Maurice Hagen, that last cooperating witness you heard from. He gave remarkable evidence about Pierce's role in this murder. While in prison, Pierce told Hagen that he didn't shoot Jason but that he hid the gun that was used to kill him and that the person who really did it — and you know that's T-Money — was now dead. That's what Pierce told him.

So let me briefly discuss the charges relating to this murder. It's charged as a conspiracy to murder members of the Melrose organization, and that's just a name that was used in the indictment to describe O's crew. It's also charged as the murder of Jason Correa in aid of racketeering, as a murder in furtherance of a drug conspiracy, and as murder through the use of a firearm. They all relate to the same conduct that I just talked about, and Judge Pauley is going to instruct you on all the legal requirements.

Now let's turn to that next homicide. Let's talk

about the murder of Carrel Ogarro. Carrel was a young man from a caring family who also lived in the Jackson and Melrose projects. And after moving there, Carrel developed a drug problem. You heard he had used dust, or PCP, and at some point he was arrested on a drug charge, and rumors started to circulate throughout the neighborhood that Carrel was snitching, meaning that he was giving information to law enforcement.

Now people in the neighborhood just didn't trust

Carrel because of those rumors. You heard T-Money, HD, Joshua

Meregildo's older brother. Even Chris Ogarro, who had nothing

to do with this crew, came here and told you that he heard

these same rumors about Carrel and it concerned him.

Now those rumors were so persistent and such a threat to T-Money and his crew who were selling drugs on Courtlandt Avenue, threatened by what they thought was a snitch, that they took action. The first step was T-Money asking Parsons and Meregildo to kill Carrel and offering them \$5,000 each to do it. That's what Parsons told you. Later, on July 30<sup>th</sup>, Meregildo and another GFC member, Walter Aponte, waited for Carrel in the courtyard behind the 300 building that you heard about in the Court -- in the Jackson-Melrose projects. Parsons met Meregildo and Aponte outside, and Meregildo said he had a .380 pistol with three shots in it. This same .380 pistol. Pierce's silver and black gun.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now you also heard from Parsons that Meregildo saw Carrel sitting on a bench. He walked over and actually tried to shoot Carrel, but the safety was on so the gun didn't go off. After that the three men -- Meregildo, Parsons, and Aponte -- went to another apartment and picked up another gun, and this was one of the same apartments you've heard about that the crew maintained to hold its drugs and guns.

Now there's no serious dispute that after they left that second apartment, Parsons had a .22-caliber revolver and Meregildo had that same .380-caliber pistol. And Parsons said -- and this is -- becomes important -- that they left that apartment around 5 a.m. to go back out to look for Carrel. then they saw Carrel again in that same courtyard, and here's what Parsons described what happened:

He, Carrel, came through the path. He was walking towards us. We were standing there. He stopped. He asked us, he said, what's up. We said what's up. He put his hands in like the back of his pants, like, I don't know if he was going to pull out something. I back up. Parsons says. Killa pulled out the gun -- remember he had the .380 -- and fired. He, Carrel, tried to run. Killa fired again. I fired. And Killa fired again and ran in the back door. And I then -- Parsons says, I walked up to him, stood over him, and fired about five times.

That's horrible. That's a vicious, nauseating account

Summation - Mr. Fee

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

11

12

1314

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

of a murder that Parsons gave you, and no one in this room is ever going to tell you that Devin Parsons is anything other than a criminal and a murderer. But the important point for what you need to do back in that jury room, while deliberating, is to think about, does that sound like the truth?

Now there's overwhelming corroboration of Parsons' testimony. Other witnesses, other evidence. And I'm going to talk about all of that, but let's just talk about what Parsons told you very briefly. This, what you just saw, is not what you would expect to hear if Parsons was making up lies to keep himself out of trouble and to get others into trouble. It's just not. Parsons told you that after Meregildo shot Carrel a few times, Meregildo ran away. Then Parsons walked up to the dead or dying body of Carrel and shot him five times, including once in the head, using that .22 pistol he talked about. So we're clear, Parsons sat on that witness stand and told you that Meregildo shot a few times, ran away, Parsons took the gun and shot Carrel Ogarro five times. Use your own common sense, your own judgment. In that testimony who sounds like a worse Who comes off as someone willing to do more serious There's no question that that is Parsons. So once again, the important question here is not whether Parsons is a murderer, because you know he pled quilty to those serious crimes -- to that crime and other serious crimes. important question right now, right now in this case, is, do

Summation - Mr. Fee

you think Parsons is telling the truth? And the answer is clear from his account that for all his extremely serious crimes, Parsons sat on that stand and laid it all out for you to the best of his ability.

What happened after they shot Carrel? Well, Parsons told you that the three of them ran back to Aponte's apartment, and there Parsons told you that he had that young lady,
Brittany Brown come and carry a bag with the two guns — this
.380 and the .22 — back to Parsons' apartment. Ms. Brown told you that she was testifying here pursuant to a subpoena and immunity order and she didn't want to be here. But she did tell you what happened that day, and she corroborated in important parts what Parsons told you. She said she went to Aponte's apartment after the murder, she saw all three of the people that Parsons told you were involved — Joshua Meregildo, Parsons, and Aponte. And then Ms. Brown and Parsons went back to Parsons' apartment, 681, and Parsons told her that day, "We killed Carrel. Meregildo fired first, and I finished him off."

And there's overwhelming corroboration of what you learned from Parsons, who also told you, by the way, that he took those two guns that day down to Harlem to try and get rid of them, but then he had to go back and later he said because Pierce wanted his .380 back. That's what Parsons told you.

Now what else do you know about this murder and how

Summation - Mr. Fee

else do you know Parsons gave you an absolutely accurate account? First, Folks. Folks was not there that night, but he was close with Meregildo, and Meregildo told Folks exactly what happened only a couple days after Meregildo had killed Carrel. Here's what Folks said Meregildo told him:

He killed him because he said he felt he was moving funny. He was with Dev and Walt and he shot him. He caught him in his old building, 300. He shot him in the building somewhere. Some way he, Carrel, made it out of the building.

And then he talks about where this happened:

A little play area. He made it past there and ran in towards the direction of the right side of the bird cage, back in front of the building. And that's when he, Meregildo, killed him at, going up that path.

That's remarkable. Think about for a moment all the ways that this admission from Meregildo interlocks exactly with what Parsons told you. First, moving funny. That's basically how Parsons said T-Money talked about Carrel. Folks learned that from Meregildo. Next, Meregildo said he did it with Dev and Walt. That's Parsons and Aponte, the same people that Parsons talked about, the same people that Ms. Brown saw in the apartment after the murder. Next, Meregildo tells Folks that Carrel ran out of the building, crossed the playground, and was shot as he ran up the path. Now that's basically what Parsons told you. And that's how it happened, because that's what

Meregildo said as well.

Now this testimony from Parsons and Folks is corroborated by other evidence in this case. Evidence from witnesses that no one is arguing are lying or making things up. Dr. Ely was a medical examiner in this case from the New York City Office of the Chief Medical Examiner. She did the autopsy on Carrel. She told you Carrel had seven gunshot wounds. One of them entered his left chest, and that's where they found that .380 bullet from this gun. And who had the .380 that night? Meregildo, according to what you know.

And Parsons told you about when the killers confronted Carrel, and I just want to bring this up again because it ties into what Dr. Ely told you. This is when they first confronted Carrel:

We had our hands in our pocket. He looked at us, he stepped back, and he put his hands behind his back. Next Killa pulled out the gun and Killa shot.

Then he talks about Killa running, again, Killa hit him in his lower back, and again, Killa had the .380, Parsons had the .22.

So no one is going to stand before you and argue that Parsons had any idea about what Dr. Ely found in her autopsy, or that he knew what she was planning to tell you in this courtroom. But Parsons' testimony about Meregildo holding the .380 and shooting first at Carrel as he was facing his killers

Summation - Mr. Fee

is corroborated exactly by what Dr. Ely told you.

Meregildo -- Parsons said that Meregildo had this .380, shot first, Carrel was standing face to face. Now according to Dr. Ely, there was one shot in Carrel Ogarro's body that entered from the front, and that's the shot from the .380 gun that left .380 bullets in Carrel's chest. Dr. Ely told you that every other shot either entered from the back of Carrel or at an odd angle, like the bullet in the top of Carrel's head that she talked about. And this confirms what you were already told about this murder by Parsons -- that Meregildo shot first with that .380 while he was facing Carrel.

Parsons is also corroborated by the ballistics expert,

Detective Fox. Detective Fox told you that his tests showed

that two guns were used in the murder of Carrel -- two, just as

Parsons told you. There were two guns there. Detective Fox's

tests also showed that the bullet recovered from Carrel's skull

did not come from a .380, and again, Parsons told you he shot

Carrel in the head with the .22.

Finally, the cell site records. These were the maps and charts that FBI Agent Perry used to tell you about these records, and they basically show where Meregildo's phone was at the night he killed Carrel. And there's three reasons you know this was Meregildo's phone and that he was using the phone that night. Number one, you heard Agent Castillo that this same 347 phone number was the one listed as Killa's number in Dev's

phone, that Meregildo himself listed this number as his own phone and the iPhone that was seized from him at the time of his arrest by the ATF, and as you saw in these charts, before and after the murder, that phone goes back to where Meregildo was living at, 2235 Haviland. And these records leave really absolutely no doubt that Meregildo was in the area where Carrel was killed before, during, and after that murder.

So let's look at one of these.

Now those are the areas where Josh Meregildo's cellphone was located during the night Carrel was killed, and you don't need to have the same level of understanding that Agent Perry has to know what this means. It makes clear that Joshua Meregildo was in and around that area all night.

What about when Carrel was killed? You heard from Parsons that they went out to look for Carrel at around 5 a.m. Then they sat around and waited for some time. And then eventually they found Carrel and killed him. That's what Parsons told you. And Officer Guzman — she was the woman who found Carrel's body — she also said that she heard the shots at around 5:45 a.m. and went to find the body seconds later. So again, it corroborates Parsons' time line pretty much that night.

Now what did these cell site records and the phone records say about what Meregildo was doing at that time? Let's look at one of them.

That blue fan is the call that Meregildo made at 5:01 a.m., and so he was in that area around where Carrel died, 300 East 158. That's where Carrel's body was found. It's marked with a red dot in the center -- the red dot with the black dot inside of it. Now that was the last call Meregildo made until about 6:10 a.m., which is the call hitting the area marked with the yellow fan. So what does that tell you? That Meregildo stayed in that area between 5 -- excuse me -- 5:01 and 6:10 a.m.

Summation - Mr. Fee

Now let's go to the phone records as well.

So remember on these, the zero-second calls are text messages, you were told. If you look, there were zero calls, zero texts between 5:04 and 5:25, while they're looking for Carrel. And then there's a couple more texts and then again silence between 5:30 and 6:08 on the morning Carrel was killed. This is Meregildo's cellphone. So you know for sure, based on the other evidence, what Meregildo was actually doing at that time. He was stalking and shooting Carrel. And these records corroborate that testimony and that other evidence again.

And again, this murder is charged in four different ways. All of them relate to the same conduct that we just talked about on Meregildo, and for the racketeering-related murder counts, it's clear in this evidence that Meregildo committed this murder both to maintain and enhance his position in the crew. That's something you'll be asked to decide. And

that he also did it for financial gain. Meregildo did this murder to maintain his position as a leader and as a good soldier in the eyes of T-Money and the other members of this crew.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is Young Killa. Now however he first got that nickname, in 2010, he began to literally live up to that.

Let's talk about the third murder you learned about, the murder of Delquan Alston.

Delquan Alston was not in GFC, he was not a leader of any group on Courtlandt Avenue. He was just someone who was in the neighborhood and, as you heard, sold fake drugs on occasion. He was murdered by Parsons and this man, Melvin Colon, at T-Money's request.

Now why did Colon and Parsons kill Delquan? Two reasons. First, Delquan asked the wrong questions at the wrong time. You heard about the -- about all the violence that was going on the summer of 2010, the attempt on T-Money's life, and in the middle of this extremely tense violent situation, Delquan started asking repeatedly about money that was being offered to kill T-Money. That made Delquan seem like a threat to this crew.

Second, you heard that Mel -- that Delquan was selling fake drugs and that crew members thought that was messing up their business. Crocker and Parsons talked about this. It was

Summation - Mr. Fee

bad that Delquan sold fake crack to the crew's customers, because people who bought fake crack wouldn't come back a second time. So T-Money asked Colon and Parsons to commit the murder, and he offered to pay them. Colon and Parsons did exactly what T-Money asked them to do, and that's what the evidence showed you. Parsons gave a detailed account of what happened on the night Delquan was murdered, and I submit that it was accurate and you can rely on it. And again, Parsons has pled guilty to committing this murder and other murders, and he's going to be sentenced for his crimes. But the important thing, the only important thing here and now, is for you to scrutinize Parsons' testimony and assess whether it was truthful in this case.

So what happened that night? Pemberton is drinking —
Aubrey Pemberton — with Delquan, when Parsons shows up.

Pemberton leaves to go to that party he talked about. Then

Parsons and Delquan meet up with Colon. Again, Delquan talks

about needing money and the money being offered to kill

T-Money. Parsons and Colon looked at each other, and Dev goes

to get a gun. Parsons gets a gun from Villafranco's

apartment — Carlos Villafranco — and he brings it back. He

brings this gun, this big gun, the .40-caliber.

Now having this gun, Parsons and Colon walk around some more with Delquan, waiting. At some point Delquan stops to urinate against the side of 285 East 153. And that's right

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summation - Mr. Fee

there, behind that black fence, where Delquan stops to use the restroom. At that point Colon -- and you see he's writing with his right hand right there, ladies and gentlemen. He pulls out this .40, this gun, and he holds it just next to Delquan's right ear, behind his right ear, about 2 feet away. And you know that Colon is just about the same height as Delguan, both around 6 feet. You heard that in testimony. So Colon's arm is just about level with Delquan's right ear when he's holding that gun. And then Colon waits. He's nervous. He thinks, this is my first murder, my first body. He hears Parsons tell him to shoot and then he fires. The first shot spins Delquan around so he's face to face with Colon, and Colon is shocked. He sees Delquan and he fires again, which sends Delquan to the ground face down. At that point Parsons takes the gun, and for a second time that summer, Devin Parsons fires at a dead or dying victim of the crew's violence. That's how it happened. And there are literally dozens of points of

corroboration for each of the witnesses who talked about -from each of the witnesses who talked about this homicide from what Parsons told you, and at this point, after hearing all of these witnesses and all of this evidence, we need to be straight about this fact: Colon committed this murder. there's overwhelming evidence.

Parsons. He gave you a detailed account of what happened that night and of Colon's role in it.

Summation - Mr. Fee

Villafranco. Villafranco was holding this gun, this .40-caliber pistol, in his apartment. Parsons came that night, took the gun from Villafranco, as Villafranco told you, and then later Parsons and Colon brought it back. And Villafranco told you a detail that you only remember if you're recounting true events. He said this gun smelled like gunpowder when they handed it back. And Villafranco told you what happened in between the time the gun left and came back. Villafranco heard gunshots, he looked out the window, and he saw Parsons and Melly, as he put it, running back towards the building where Villafranco was staying.

The third way you know Parsons is telling the truth is what Folks told you. Folks heard it directly from Colon. And here's what Colon told Folks about this murder:

He said he got him drunk, 'cause he knew he was going to have to use the bathroom. And this is Colon talking about Delquan. He kept giving him drinks. When Black — that was Delquan's name as you heard, nickname. When Black went to go use the bathroom, he came from behind him, shot him in his head a couple of times, and then he flipped over the gate, he shot him some more, passed the gun to Dev, Dev shot him.

Now you know this was not a story Folks created with Parsons because it's a little different. Like that detail about Delquan flipping over the gate, Parsons never told you that. But this is what Folks learned from Colon. And it

5888 Summation - Mr. Fee

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23 24

25

The reason why he had the gun behind his head so long, 19

"then he shot him again."

Again, not boasting or bragging. This is one friend

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

Now the fourth way you know what happened on that night is the testimony of Pemberton, and again, Pemberton heard

corroborates all the important details you heard from Parsons.

it directly from Colon, who admitted all the important details about this murder. Colon even told Pemberton that after the murder, Colon and Parsons went back to Villafranco's apartment

and gave him the gun. And most recently Colon talked about it

in federal prison.

Remember this photograph? Pemberton told you, Colon bragged to Pemberton and others about what he did to Delguan. He told him, he said the .40, this gun, knocked him out of his sneakers. Pemberton understood that to mean when he shot him, when he shot Delquan, Delquan flew out of his sneakers.

Now this is clearly not just boasting or bragging by This is nonfiction, ladies and gentlemen. This is one Colon. friend telling another friend about this murder.

Crocker also talked to Colon in prison. And here's what Colon told Crocker:

because he was about to catch his first murder. Is what Colon was telling Crocker. And when he shot him in the head, Black turned around and looked at him in the eyes. And it was -- and it was scary, that he shot him again. And I believe that's

(212) 805-0300

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summation - Mr. Fee

telling another what it feels like to shoot and kill a man in cold blood for the first time. That's Colon saying exactly what he did and how he was scared and nervous, but he did it anyway because he wanted to get his first murder for this crew.

Now sixth reason you know what happened that night is what you learned relatively recently from Maurice Hagen. Remember Hagen first learned about this murder when Colon was showing a crowd of inmates some of the discovery, the evidence in this case, and Colon was laughing and bragging about how, as Colon put it, we shot this guy in the dick. And you also -you heard that Colon confided in Hagen and said that Colon told him that they killed Delquan because Delquan was threatening to kill one of Colon's friends, and you know who he was talking about -- T-Money. They saw Delquan as a threat.

Now even beyond what you learned from these cooperating witnesses, from other people in prison or people who committed crimes with Colon, there's other really remarkable evidence. Dikeem Hill, that young man told you what happened that night. He was in his apartment on the third floor of 285 East 156 and he was awakened by shots while he was sleeping. He said his window was on the third floor just above where Alston's body was laying, so just north of this picture. And then when he looked out his window, Dikeem Hill saw two men running from his building toward the 301 building, and that's the building that Villafranco and Parsons talked -- told you

about where Villafranco was staying. And you know now that the men Mr. Hill saw were Colon and Parsons. And this is truly remarkable corroboration. Mr. Hill told you he saw two men running from the scene of Delquan's murder, two men, just like Parsons told you, just like Villafranco told you, just as the other witnesses told you, and no one, absolutely no one is going to stand before you and argue that Dikeem Hill was making anything up on that witness stand, because Dikeem Hill is like most of the people in the Jackson-Melrose projects — a good person, hard-working person. He's a college student, one of the many people there who has to deal with the crimes done by the very few, by men like Melvin Colon —

MR. DINNERSTEIN: Objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. FEE: Another way you know what happened that night and that the cooperating witnesses are telling you the truth is what was recovered by the NYPD Crime Scene Unit. Now CSU found a series of shell casings there at the scene where Delquan was shot and killed. And there's a picture of it. The shell casings, they're in the photo on the left-hand side marked with yellow markers, and you heard that these were all .40-caliber bullets -- again, just like Parsons and the other witnesses told you. And on the left is -- behind that gate is where Officer McLean found Delquan's body, just like the witnesses told you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And then finally, another reason you know that Parsons and the other witnesses are telling you the truth on this murder is the testimony you heard from Dr. Prial, Margaret Prial, again from the medical examiner's office. She conducted the autopsy on Carrel -- excuse me -- on Delquan. And she told you about Delquan, just over 6 feet, otherwise healthy. He had 7 three gunshot wounds that she found. First, one gunshot wound to his head, right behind his right ear, and there was a bullet lodged in his brain. Dr. Prial told you that this wound, as she put it, was without vertical deviation. And you remember she defined that for you. It meant the bullet flew straight, 12 someone shot it at the same level as where it entered the body. And you know from all the other evidence that there were two 14 men there that night -- Parsons and Colon. Agent Castillo told you, Parsons is about 5,6, Colon is about 6 feet.

MR. DINNERSTEIN: Objection, your Honor. There's no evidence to that.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. FEE: Agent Castillo told you that Colon was around 6 feet, around the same height as Delquan Alston. here's how someone would point the gun at someone around the same height standing roughly upright. And here's how's a much shorter man would point the gun at someone who was 6 feet and standing upright.

The medical evidence tells you what happened here, and

Summation - Mr. Fee

**f 216** 5892

you know a man of about 6 feet did the shooting because Delquan was standing roughly upright. He was urinating when he got shot. That makes absolute sense, and it lines up with everything else you've heard about this murder. Mr. Colon is the man who shot Delquan in the head.

Finally, you heard the ballistics evidence from

Detective Fox. He told you that this .40 right here, this gun,

was the gun that was used to shoot Delquan in the head. He

also told you that the casings at the scene, all of those

casings matched up with this gun. And again, this murder is

charged in the same four ways as the other two murders. And

Judge Pauley again will instruct you on the legal requirements.

Let's now turn to the charges relating to the murder conspiracy and the assault and attempted murder that you heard about against members of what is called the 321 organization.

That -- that name, the 321 organization, is a name used to describe Luchie's drug crew which you heard operated out of in part the 321 building in the Melrose projects.

Now Pierce and Meregildo are charged with this crime -- with these crimes, and there's overwhelming evidence that both of them agreed to kill and actually tried to kill members of Luchie's crew. After T-Money was murdered you heard that the belief among the crew was that someone from Luchie's group had sent someone to kill T-Money. Pierce, as you heard over and over again, was extremely close with T-Money, and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summation - Mr. Fee

Meregildo had held T-Money so dear that he marked his skin with T-Money's name. He also held photos of T-Money on that little memory stick that he kept in his pants for almost half a year after T-Money was killed. There's that Mac In Peace T-Money photo that was recovered from Meregildo when he was arrested.

And Folks told you what happened on September 13<sup>th</sup>, 2010, just a few days after T-Money was killed. Folks was at another crew member's apartment, Dante Barber, which was actually in the 321 building. Meregildo called Folks and asked him to bring down a gun -- this same .40-caliber pistol. Parsons told you that same night Pierce, Earl Pierce, called Parsons and also asked Parsons to bring down the gun. Parsons told you that's what he remembered doing along with Folks. So both Pierce and Parsons bring down this .40-caliber gun to Meregildo and Pierce. And as you heard from both Parsons and Folks, three men -- Folks, Meregildo, and Pierce -- then got in a cab and took off. And in that cab Pierce told Folks that he also had a gun, a second gun, a 9-millimeter pistol. Folks also told you he was wearing a red hoodie that night.

So then all three of them go to Harlem, Folks told you, to go see a member of T-Money's family, and then they come back at 321 to retaliate, retaliate against Luchie's crew, and Folks again told you what happened. Pierce got out of the cab, pulled out a gun, and shot at Tarean Joseph, a member of Luchie's crew, several times. Tarean Joseph started to run

25

away, and Meregildo and Pierce both told Folks what to do as 1 2 Joseph was running away. Folks told you: 3 He ran past me. I could have been shooting but I 4 He got past me, and then Killa and Ski Box was yelling 5 shoot him, shoot him. So I started shooting. 6 Folks told you. Folks also told you that after this 7 another member of the crew, a man he knew as String Bean, came out of the 321 building and started firing back. Everybody 8 9 ran. You heard Folks took this .40-caliber gun and threw it in 10 the garbage, which is where the NYPD recovered it. 11 You also learned about the gun that Pierce had that 12 day, that 9-millimeter pistol. You heard again and again about 13 Miranda having that 9-millimeter, and Folks heard it 14 directly --15 MR. BECKER: Objection. 16 THE COURT: Overruled. 17 MR. FEE: -- Folks heard it directly from Miranda while both men were in prison. Here's what Folks told you: 18 Q. You mentioned that Pierce was using a silver and 19 20 black 9-millimeter. After that event took place did you ever 21 have a conversation with anyone about the gun? 22 Folks says: 23

I spoke to PayDay. PayDay said the person asked him for the gun like he needed it. He gave it to him.

Now Pemberton also learned about this same shooting on

Summation - Mr. Fee

the night it happened. He was in an apartment with Folks, Pierce, and Meregildo, and all three of those men talked about what they did, and it interlocked perfectly with what Folks told you as Pemberton told you on the stand. They went to shoot at 321, they said, Pierce had a 9-millimeter, Folks had a .40, which he threw in the garbage. Pemberton even remembered that one of them was wearing a hoodie, a red hoodie.

Crocker also learned about this in prison from Pierce.
Here's what Pierce told Crocker:

"Q. What did Ski Box say about his own role in that attempt to retaliate?"

Crocker learned from Pierce: He shot somebody and he was going over to finish shooting, somebody came out the building and started shooting back at him, and they was both shooting at each other, Crocker said.

What, if anything --

"Q. What, if anything, did Ski Box say about who he was shooting at at 321?

"Somebody that -- people that had something to do with T-Money's death.

"What, if anything, did Ski Box say about why he did that?"

Crocker heard from Pierce: "Because it looked like they were celebrating. They was drinking -- outside drinking liquor, and it looked like they were celebrating... T-Money's

death."

1

3

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

Finally, you heard the 911 call. I'm going to play part of one. Listen closely to what the caller's saying and listen to how it corroborates what you heard from the corroborating witnesses.

(Audio played)

MR. FEE: Again, three guys, shooting at guys on benches. She even describes somebody wearing an orange shirt.

And ladies and gentlemen, again and again you see this scheme, this pattern in this trial. You learn about crimes committed by these defendants -- drugs sold by Miranda, murders committed by Pierce, Colon, or Meregildo -- and then you've heard it from another cooperating witness with another slightly different perspective, who heard it directly from one of these defendants, and those witnesses' accounts have linked up with the other witnesses' accounts in a way that demonstrates that they are in fact telling you the truth.

And then you've seen other evidence -- forensic evidence, autopsies, ballistics, cellphones, photographs, Facebook posts, sometimes an outside witness like Dikeem Hill or Brittany Brown or police officer who responded to a crime, and each and every time you've seen this other evidence, this evidence, what the cooperating witness told you, it is absolutely corroborated in important details by what you learned from these witnesses. Every time. It's no accident.

That's no mistake. And of course it's not the result of some incredibly convoluted conspiracy amongst the cooperators to come up with a story. That has happened because you've been hearing the truth from these witnesses and from the other evidence in this case. And it has overwhelmingly revealed that these defendants are exactly what the evidence shows them to be. They committed these crimes.

Now the charges, briefly, relating to this shooting at the 321 building, Meregildo and Pierce are both charged with conspiracy to murder members of Luchie's crew. Again, that's called the 321 organization. And the assault and attempted murder of Tarean Joseph, that man who was shot. They both face a firearms charge related to the use of guns during this crime. And Judge Pauley is going to explain the law to you again for these charges, but at this point the evidence has absolutely shown that Pierce and Meregildo are guilty of these crimes.

You learned of another rivalry that this crew was involved in, another battle that Colon and T-Money and others fought with guns and bullets. What I'm talking about is the crew had a longstanding dispute with the Young Guns gang, or the YGs, who lived at the Maria Lopez Houses in an apartment complex just south of the Jackson and Melrose projects. And ladies and gentlemen, at this point, after all the evidence you've seen and heard, there is really no longer any serious dispute that there was an ongoing gang war between this crew

Summation - Mr. Fee

and the YGs of Maria Lopez, from at least 2010 through
September of 2011. And there is also no serious dispute that
members of the crew frequently, very frequently, traveled to
places nearby the Maria Lopez Houses and shot at and tried to
kill YGs. The evidence is overwhelming on those points.

Crocker, Pemberton, Folks, Parsons, Villafranco, each of these
men told you about shootings that Colon committed where they
shot at and tried to kill YGs or where he was helping others
who were going down to shoot at and try to kill YGs. And you
learned that these shootings happened with really shocking
regularity during the summer of 2010 throughout 2011.

But the focus of this charge relates to what happened to Mr. Jiang, on September 8<sup>th</sup> of 2011, near the corner of East 151 and Morris Avenue. And you remember this was the night when Colon and Pemberton and three other crew members got together to shoot at the YGs. Now earlier that day you heard from Pemberton that Colon and others had been threatened by a group of YGs who had razor blades. They came back to Courtlandt, and Colon told Pemberton what happened. Pemberton sent Kevin Pinero, he told you — and Pinero is another crew member — to get this gun, this 9-millimeter gun, from one of the crew's nearby apartments, and once they had this gun, they went to go get revenge, retaliate on the YGs who had confronted them earlier in that day. Pemberton gave you all the important details. Pemberton told you that when they got to Morris

Avenue, he sent SB -- and you heard that was Kevin Pinero's nickname -- around the corner to see who was there. And he said he came back and said, there's a lot of them. Get over there. Then Pemberton said, "Melly was in my ear telling me shoot four and give him four. I said, all right, I got you."

Summation - Mr. Fee

And Pemberton tells you what he did. He went to the corner, he saw them all at the corner, and he shot eight times.

Now there's really no serious dispute at this point that Colon was present before, during, and after the time that Pemberton shot at the YGs and hit Mr. Jiang, because no one can seriously dispute that the surveillance videos you saw -- I'm sure you recall them -- show what they show.

Here's just one still from one of those videos.

And you heard Pemberton testify in the front that's Kevin Pinero, or SB, who's going to look around the corner; then that's Hump, or Felipe Blanding, another crew member, Pemberton told you; the back left in the white, that's Pemberton; and right next to him is Colon. And you saw a number of these video clips from the night Mr. Jiang was shot, and there's no doubt, based on these, that Colon was traveling with these men and working with them that entire night.

Another still from one of these videos. This is the group running back after the shooting, and you see Aponte trailing and the other three men up ahead.

And you heard about what happened to Mr. Jiang, that

Summation - Mr. Fee

he was working and working until what Colon and Pemberton did while trying to get back at YGs took away the ability for him to do work.

Now I briefly want to address a few arguments that I expect defense counsel is going to raise on this point.

First, I think -- I expect Colon's attorney is going to argue that Colon himself was an innocent bystander at the shooting and that he was as surprised as anyone else when Pemberton shot. Now let's be clear. This argument is based solely on the speculation of Colon's attorney, and this argument does not relate to the actual evidence in this case, which makes it overwhelmingly clear that Colon was an active participant in this conspiracy to murder YGs and in the shooting of Mr. Jiang. How do you know this?

First, Pemberton's testimony, which has been corroborated over and over again, both on this incident and on dozens of other points in this case.

Second reason you know, what else do you know about Colon? Again, look at his tattoos.

(Continued on next page)

23

24

25

MR. FEE: That's his hand you heard, and it says YGK. And you also heard what YGK stands for. Young Gunnas Killas, and a Facebook post in September 2011: Man, I paved the way for that.

Let me say this in a different way. Melvin Colon has a tattoo where he labeled himself a person who tries to murder members of the YGs gang. That's what this charge is about. There is no mystery here, and all the other evidence confirms it. Colon is guilty.

Look what he wrote on Facebook. August 2011, status message: Me getting robbed is like a YG N word coming through Courtlandt. It doesn't happen.

Another, this is a chat. The author is Melly Mel Balla which you heard is Colon. Look at the date. 09-09-2011. September 9, 2011. The day after Mr. Jiang was shot. Melvin Colon said: LOL. On third the YGs tried to jump me and Walt and Hump. We got off direct LOL. I pop it though but we did our thang already, you know.

Then another. Again, the day after: Yeah, they was deep but they expected N words to stay there LOL. Dubb and all them N words had blades word but we violated.

Let's compare what Colon wrote in those Facebook posts from the day after the shooting of Jiang to what Pemberton told you on the stand. What happened earlier that day before they went to shoot at the YGs. Melly, Walt and Hump came to -- same

CBQ3MER4

Summation - Mr. Fee

people Colon talked about. They came to -- well, they ain't come exactly to me, but they said that they almost got into it with the YGs on Third Avenue. Third. Just like Colon said. And they ran back to Courtlandt. And Melly asked me where the gun is at. I said it's in Tay's house. Then Pemberton was asked: What, if anything, did Melly say about the weapons that the YGs had? Pemberton says razors.

Now, these details may have seemed like small details at the time. But it shows just how hard Pemberton was working to be 100 percent accurate, down to really the smallest details, ladies and gentlemen.

What leaves absolutely no question that Colon was actively involved in the shooting, and Pemberton was telling the truth about what happened, is those 911 calls. I'm not going to play it again now. But you'll recall on those calls there are callers who describe a group of four or five men running after firing a gun at 151 and Morris. One of the callers said that one of the men dropped the gun and picked it back up just like Pemberton told you Colon did. She described the clothing that Pemberton and Colon had on that night, the white T-shirt and the striped shirt.

Again, look what Pemberton told you happened after they shot. Who did you give the gun to? To Melly. That's Colon. What did you see Melly do with the gun? Put it on his waist and he tried to ride off on a bike, and it fell down his

Summation - Mr. Fee

CBQ3MER4

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Did you see the gun fall down to the ground? Nah, I heard it.

Just again, using your common sense. This suggestion that Melvin Colon had no idea what was going to happen that night. If someone had no idea that their buddy was going to pull out a gun and start shooting and hit some innocent bystander, how would they react? They would scream, they would run away, they'd get away from the guy, they'd go home, maybe they'd call police. That is the opposite of what Colon did. Colon hung around. He walked back with them. He stayed with the group. He took the gun from the man who shot. So you should reject that argument very quickly, ladies and gentlemen. Colon knew what was going on and he participated in the planning.

You also know about multiple other occasions when Colon was trying to shoot and kill YGs at Maria Lopez. Folks told you about another instance where Colon and Folks and others went to shoot at Maria Lopez in April of 2011. Folks told you they went to 151 and Morris to shoot at YGs, and both Folks and Colon were carrying a gun. Folks said he had a .357 and Colon had a .380, and there Folks told you both men were shooting at YGs when Colon passed in front and Folks accidently shot his friend in the back. Crocker told you about this as well. Colon said to Crocker we were shooting at YGs and Folks shot me in the back. Colon even showed Crocker the scars. You

CBQ3MER4

Summation - Mr. Fee

saw it in the photos there on Colon's back.

You know for certain that this instance when Colon and Folks went to shoot and try to kill YGs happened just as these witnesses told you, because you saw the physical evidence that corroborated their testimony. There the NYPD found shell casings from a .380 gun at the same location where Folks said this happened shortly after the shooting occurred. They also found nearby that same scene Colon's shirt. You remember the shirt, the bloody shirt, and it had on that shirt bullet holes and dried bloodstains exactly where Colon was hurt, was shot. You saw again that Colon himself talked about this on Facebook. Where I got shot at dead be hurting, I need a back massage, he said.

Briefly, the charges related to this. First, Colon is charged with participating in a conspiracy to murder members of Maria Lopez crew, which is the name used for the YGs in this indictment. And that's done in aid of racketeering. You heard about numerous instances where Colon shot at or helped others shoot at YGs. I don't have time to go through all of them. I talked about two today. You heard others from Parsons when he went down in 2010 with Colon to shoot at YGs. Finding Colon guilty of any of those instances where he agreed with others would be sufficient to convict on the conspiracy count.

Colon in this instance is also charged specifically with the assault and the attempted murder of Jing Bao Jiang in

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CBQ3MER4 Summation - Mr. Fee

aid of racketeering. For this charge I expect Judge Pauley is going to instruct you on many things, one of them being that as long as a defendant intended to murder somebody, or aided and abetted somebody's murder, they can still be convicted of the charge even if the shot ends up hitting somebody else. It's called transfer intent. Judge Pauley will instruct you on that.

Let's turn to the racketeering and the racketeering conspiracy counts. For count one, that's the substantive racketeering count. You simply have to find that Meregildo, Colon and Pierce, those three defendants are charged in that count, that they committed two predicate acts of racketeering. There are multiple predicates acts for each defendant. You just have to decide that they committed two of them.

MR. BECKER: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. FEE: One of the predicate acts charged is the narcotics conspiracy, and we've already talked about the proof on that count, and the murder conspiracies. The murders and assaults and attempted murders charged against Pierce, Meregildo, and Colon are also predicate acts relating to those defendants.

As you heard from Special Agent Dyer, that DEA agent. There is really no serious dispute at this point that the drugs contained in the crack sold by this crew traveled in interstate

Summation - Mr. Fee

commerce. They came from outside the United States. That's one element and I don't think it should take you much time.

Count two is the racketeering conspiracy, and for this you have to find that Meregildo, Colon, Pierce, and Miranda each agreed to participate in this racketeering enterprise.

The Courtlandt Avenue crew. That they agreed that any member of that group would commit two or more racketeering acts.

Judge Pauley will give you all those definitions.

Now, I told you that Miranda is also charged in this count. You know he participated in this racketeering conspiracy because of his role in the crew's drug business, his sharing of his gun with members of this crew, and his deep and frequent involvement in the crew's activities on Courtlandt Avenue.

As I said at the outset, the racketeering enterprise here is not defined as narrowly as I expect some of these defense lawyers may suggest. You've heard this many times during the trial, the suggestion that because someone is not GFC, they're not in one of the gangs, that they cannot be a member of the enterprise. That is not the law, and that is not the charge here.

You are incredibly familiar after all these weeks with how this crew worked on Courtlandt Avenue. T-Money burst on the drug scene of Courtlandt Avenue, and he used GFC gang members as soldiers to seize and protect this drug territory.

Summation - Mr. Fee

And Miranda and Pierce, two older, more established drug dealers, form alliances with T-Money and this GFC gang, and they all did so with a common purpose, getting more money for themselves by selling drugs. And for some of these defendants, by protecting their drug business and their territory with guns and violence. That's the enterprise here. And the evidence of these racketeering counts is almost all of the evidence you've seen in this case, you now know the links and the ties between these men and the ways they worked together to commit crimes.

Remember what Meregildo had on him when he was arrested by the ATF. He had photos stored in phones and memory sticks. He had photos with Colon, with other co-conspirators, with Folks, with Bernard Folks, Aubrey Pemberton, other pictures that aren't there with Earl Pierce. Address books that were found from Meregildo's residence with Pierce and other OGFC members' names and numbers. All of these were being carried around by Meregildo. I'm sorry. Pierce's nickname Ski was in one of Meregildo's phones. The physical address book had other names and numbers.

Some of these defendants made it plain their association by what they put on their skin. You saw the tattoos of Colon and Meregildo. They put each other's names on their arms. And then other defendants. Again, Colon and Meregildo with the identical MIP T-Money tattoo. And this is one of the photos Meregildo had: Mac in peace T-Money.

CBQ3MER4

Summation - Mr. Fee

All of this testimony that you've seen is corroborated by other evidence as well. You remember those two videos you saw. Colon rapping on that video where he said he was a YG shooter. You remember that. And all the other evidence points to the same. Points to that being absolutely true. That's a still from the other video you saw showing Miranda with the crew out on Courtlandt Avenue. You heard this was on the date T-Money died, and on that same day Miranda was supplying crack to crew members.

The most remarkable evidence I submit on these racketeering counts came from Detective Fox. I'm not going to repeat all of it. You heard it relatively recently. He was the ballistics expert. As you heard, there is really no way to seriously challenge the accuracy of what Detective Fox did with all those ballistics tests. Let's just briefly review the charts he showed you, summarizing what he found.

This is the first chart he showed you. This relates to Earl Pierce's .380 gun. It's right in the center there. Here, Detective Fox determined that this gun, the one that Pierce you heard brought outside right after T-Money died, T-Money was attempted to be killed, outside of 681 Courtlandt, Detective Fox determined this gun was used to fire the bullets found at the scene of Jason Correa's murder. And that's on the left. And to fire the bullets that were found inside of Jason's body during the autopsy. Detective Fox also determined

that this same gun was used to kill Carrel Ogarro.

So that's Pierce's gun, used by T-Money to kill one of the crew's drug rivals or someone who is believed to be working with one of the crew's drug rivals, and then the gun was passed among the crew's members ending up in Meregildo's hands only five days later. And that's, you know from all the evidence, when Meregildo used it to shoot and kill Carrel Ogarro.

Recall hearing how this gun ended up in the government's possession. This gun was handed over to the NYPD by another crew member, Hassen Brito, that 15-year-old crack dealer and Pierce's friend.

The next slide. This relates to the .40 caliber pistol. Right in the center there. This was the gun that Colon bragged about using to shoot Delquan. Colon used the .40 caliber to kill Delquan Alston on August 27, 2010. This gun was passed around and among members of the crew until it surfaced again in September of 2010. That's when Pierce and Meregildo and Folks had it when they were going to avenge T-Money's death. Folks had it that night he shot at Tarean Joseph with it. He told you.

Detective Fox found that the bullets from the scene of the Tarean Joseph shooting came from this gun, just like the bullets used at Delquan Alston's murder.

The final slide that Detective Fox showed you related to this gun, the 9-millimeter. It's silver. It used to be

Summation - Mr. Fee

black and silver, but those fell off. Detective Fox told you that this gun was used on the night Jing Bao Jiang was shot by Pemberton with Colon right by his side avenging the fight that Colon had just gotten into earlier that day with YGs.

And Fox told you this same 9-millimeter was used in the murder of someone named William Shaw on September 21, 2011. You heard testimony about this from Crocker, Pemberton as well. Crocker told that you Kevin Pinero, also called SB, who you heard about, shot and killed Shaw because Shaw had been telling crew members that they couldn't sell drugs on Courtlandt Avenue. Pinero said he used this gun to shoot Shaw, and he was there that day with Colon and other crew members. You also heard that the very next day, the NYPD stopped Pinero and they seized from him both this 9-millimeter gun, and this second .380 gun the day after the homicide.

So, that's another couple of guns following a route through multiple acts of violence done by this crew, and ending up in the hands of the government. Now, they're all here before you.

And I just want to highlight how remarkable this evidence is, because you heard a lot of testimony and a lot of evidence in this case. But here, right here, sitting in front of you, you have all the weapons — not all, I'm sorry. You have weapons used in each and every act of violence in this case, including the murder weapons.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summation - Mr. Fee

You also have objective, forensic evidence putting each of these weapons at the scene of those crimes used by these crew members and some of these defendants to commit these murders and attempted murders. And none of these findings are really in serious dispute at this point. These are the murder weapons, the attempted murder weapons, and they're right here in this courtroom.

Second, this is really the most important point. Detective Fox told you about his findings corroborates exactly what you already learned from the cooperating witnesses in this The witnesses each told you what gun was used, how it was used, when it was used, where it was used, who used it. And what Detective Fox told you corroborates all of that testimony without any distinction. I've said it before, and I'm going to repeat myself right now: This is amazing corroboration on the important details of the most important charges in this case.

None of these cooperating witnesses who testified here knew about Detective Fox's findings. They had no idea what Detective Fox would tell you on the stand. None of them. There is zero dispute about that. That's exactly the type of truly independent corroboration that should leave absolutely no doubt in your minds that these witnesses were telling you the truth about what happened out on Courtlandt Avenue.

Finally, what's other amazing evidence of Colon and

Pierce's participation in this enterprise apart from what

Detective Fox told you. Well, what did those two men do while
they were incarcerated by the federal authorities? They met

Maurice Hagen, a senior member of the Bloods gang, and they
asked him to take out former members of the crew who they
thought were going to testify against them at trial.

So let's be clear: Even after they were arrested by the federal government, Colon and Pierce were scheming to have other prisoners harmed by members of their own crew who they thought now posed a threat to the crew.

I briefly want to address just a couple of additional arguments I expect you may hear. One that I'm sure you will hear is sometimes the details of witnesses differed in details between one another, somehow indicates that they're not telling you the truth. That they're lying to you.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, you know from your own common experience, from your own common sense that that is just not how things work. People remember events differently, they recall different details, they have different perspectives.

One example. If you go back to that day, seems like months ago now, when Judge Pauley talked about a potential weather issue on Monday. He said there may be a hurricane. It you remember, Judge Pauley gave out a phone number for you to call to find out if you needed to come to court.

Now, if I were to ask each of you at the time Judge

Summation - Mr. Fee

Pauley gave out that number, who was the court reporter -we've had a couple. If some of you said it was the lovely
woman with red hair, some of you might say it was a gentleman
who is bald with a gray suit on. Some of you would say I have
no idea. The fact that you don't know or that some of your
answers may differ, does that mean you're lying? Does that
mean that Judge Pauley did not give out a number that day? Of
course not. That's just how the human brain works.

Finally, one more argument I expect they are going to raise, and actually this is something about their approach, these defense attorneys. I expect they are going to talk at great length about these cooperators and the kinds of people they are and the crimes they've committed and what you should think about them. Ms. Heller is going to respond to many of those arguments in her rebuttal.

I want to make one point. These defendants and their attorneys have no choice about what to do with these cooperators. Let me be clear. They have no choice but to call these cooperators liars. Again, the government has the burden at every stage of this case, but I want to make clear that you can scrutinize these arguments using your own common sense. These cooperators, just on the face of their testimony, even apart from all the corroborating evidence, the ballistics evidence, the forensics evidence, the autopsy evidence, more, these cooperating witnesses make it absolutely clear that these

Summation - Mr. Fee

men committed the crimes they're charged with. Joshua

Meregildo, T-Money's protege, a murderer and a drug dealer.

Colon, took control of that crew, guns and drugs. A murderer.

Pierce, helped T-Money commit a murder and tried to commit a

second murder after T-Money died. Drug dealer. Nolbert

Miranda, prolific drug dealer and a man who possessed guns.

They have to call those cooperators liars.

These attorneys are skilled, they're excellent, but they cannot confront this evidence straight on, ladies and gentlemen.

Finally, I want to talk about one requirement that you'll hear about often in the case law, and Judge Pauley will instruct you on this. It's for many of these racketeering counts you'll have to find, as Judge Pauley will tell you, that the defendants charged did something for the purpose of maintaining or enhancing their position in the enterprise. I submit that it will be clear once Judge Pauley instructs you, but these defendants, for many of the crimes they committed, it's clear why they did it. To be a good soldier in the enterprise, to eliminate threats to the crew or to their leader, and to keep their drug business humming along. That's all about the racketeering enterprise, the Courtlandt Avenue crew in this case.

Before I sit down, before I finish, I want to say something about the victims in this case. You heard that some

Summation - Mr. Fee

Filed 12/18/12

of these victims used drugs or sold drugs or fake drugs. And of course you know that the law does not distinguish between victims. Everyone in this courtroom gets treated equally, and deserves the respect and dignity that these victims were denied out in the world by some of these defendants.

Carrel Ogarro had his faults, as you heard. You also heard about Jason Correa and Delquan Alston. They were not perfect. But that does not mean a thing in this courtroom when you weigh in on the guilt of these defendants. There is a risk in this case that we can all get bogged down in little disagreements between attorneys or the details of irrelevant issues like whether Maurice Hagen told his parole officer about all his trips to McDonald's several years ago.

We can sometimes focus on these minor issues and lose sight about what this case, at its core, at its essence, is all about. I ask you not to do that here. I don't want you to forget that these were men. Not just names. Not just victims. Not just someone Melvin Colon mocks about shooting. These were men. These were people who got sad, and happy, and loved, and struggled. Men with sisters and brothers and girlfriends, fathers and mothers. Chris Ogarro does not have a brother any longer. Iris Perez doesn't have a son. Those are victims too.

So please scrutinize the evidence in this case carefully and reach a verdict based only on what you saw and heard in this courtroom. But don't forget that this case at

CBQ3MER4

Summation - Mr. Fee

its core is about these four defendants and the crimes they committed only about 9 miles away from this courthouse in a community where good people work hard. Because right here and right now, these four men sit before you responsible for so much bad: Drug dealing, violence, or murder.

And these defendants, these four defendants involved themselves in those crimes knowing that it was wrong. Knowing that it would cause harm to people just trying to live their lives. These defendants did it anyway, because they wanted the money and the power for themselves and for this crew.

Now, right here and now, I ask you to return the only verdict consistent with everything you've seen and heard in this case. The only verdict consistent with your common sense. That is finding these four defendants guilty of the crimes charged. Thank you.

THE COURT: Members of the jury, we've concluded the first of the closing arguments. We're going to take a luncheon recess now. Your lunches are waiting for you in the jury room. We're going to reconvene at 1 o'clock and begin to hear summations on behalf of the defendants.

Keep an open mind, come to no conclusions. Don't discuss the case during the luncheon recess. And we will return to the courtroom and resume at 1 o'clock. Please recess the jury.

(Jury excused)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5917

THE COURT: Are there any issues that counsel wish to raise at this time?

MS. HELLER: Your Honor, I do at some point before Mr. Lee's summation want to address his demonstratives. do that after the break.

THE COURT: Why don't we do it now.

MS. HELLER: All right. We were handed this morning two pages. One marked slide 41 and one marked slide 46.

THE COURT: I now have them before me.

MS. HELLER: Addressing slide 46 first, our objection to this slide is that we believe it's simply an incorrect statement of the law. And the parties worked very hard all together with the Court on the jury charge which sets forth the elements of murder in aid of racketeering. And the charge is very clear and the law is very clear that a murder in aid of racketeering, one of the elements is that it be committed either to maintain or increase one's position in the enterprise, or for pecuniary gain. It's not doesn't have to be both.

So, this slide is actually misleading on the law and I think could lead to a lot of confusion for the jury if Mr. Lee's allowed to show it. Or to argue, frankly, that if the murder wasn't committed for gain of money, it's not a murder in aid of racketeering. It's not a correct statement of the law and the charge is clear on that. Certainly the case

law is clear on that. We certainly object to that slide as misleading and incorrect.

The second slide, slide 41, is a little closer to the line. Certainly if a murder was committed only for personal reason then, yes, it's not a murder in aid of racketeering. But if it's committed for a personal reason and for the other reasons, then it could well be a murder in aid of racketeering. And I think the evidence here showed certainly that the murder was committed for T-Money. And I expect Mr. Lee's going to argue that the murder was actually committed because of Walter Aponte. It's still a fellow gang member. So, I'm not clear on what the personal reason really even is in the evidence. But, either way we think this slide is a little closer to the line but could be misleading as well on the law.

THE COURT: Mr. Lee?

MR. LEE: Your Honor, I'll respond in the order that Ms. Heller made her comments. The slide that says murder not committed for payment of money. The government's one witness as to the murder of Mr. Ogarro was Dev Parsons. His testimony was specific and Mr. Fee's summation was specific that payment was — money was offered to Dev Parsons and Mr. Meregildo for the killing, the murder of Mr. Ogarro. I want to argue to the jury that there is evidence that the murder was not committed for payment of money, and that this demonstrative piece of this diagram is merely to enforce the — to reinforce my statements

1 to the jury when I'm making that statement.

The government is free, there is not a misrepresentation of the law. This is the government's theory. And the government is free to rebut and point out to the jury that there is multiple theories on multiple statutes that an act can be charged pursuant to.

My argument is a fair statement, consistent with the government's theory, and my statements to rebut and defend against it.

Similarly, your Honor, as to the other slide, murder committed for personal reason. I have a lot of testimony to show the jury that there are statements by Mr. Parsons himself and other people testifying that a personal reason not related to anything in connection with the charged enterprise, was the purpose of fear by Mr. Ogarro — by Mr. Aponte of Mr. Ogarro, the victim. Personal having nothing to do with it.

This is the defense theory, and it contradicts what the government's theory is. And it arises, this demonstrative diagram arises out of the actual testimony of the government's cooperating witness. I'm just reinforcing when I cite the government's witness what he says. My argument that if it is what he admitted it was, then it is a basis for their deliberations and their decision that the elements have not been met. I think it's a fair piece of demonstrative evidence. The government can utilize their testimony to rebut if they

CBQ3MER4

want. Perhaps they're trying to save time having to rebut that point. But they have every opportunity to point out to the jury what the elements are, and certainly, your Honor is going to clearly instruct them on what it is and I think it's fair comment, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Slide 46 is excluded and not to be shown to the jury because it is not an accurate statement of the law or the theories in the indictment. With respect to slide 41, the government's objection is overruled.

Anything further?

MR. LEE: Your Honor, briefly, if I could alter slide 46 to have the arrow pointing and saying that it is just a not guilty -- if I could just have one moment, your Honor. That's not what I meant to say.

Your Honor, I can alter slide 46 to address the government's concern to include their objection that if it's a murder not committed for payment of money, or to enhance or maintain one's position in an enterprise, then it's not murder in aid of racketeering.

THE COURT: You can prepare such a slide and we'll review it. But I think that would be an accurate statement of the law.

MR. LEE: I can do that, your Honor. I will try to do that and give it to your Honor as soon as I can.

THE COURT: All right. And provide it to the

```
government. Anything further?
1
 2
               MR. DINNERSTEIN: I just handed the government certain
 3
      PowerPoint presentations. They're reviewing them at this time.
 4
               THE COURT: We'll take it up a few minutes before
5
      1 o'clock.
6
               All right. At this time the defendants can be
 7
      escorted from the courtroom. We'll reconvene just before
8
      1 o'clock.
9
               (Recess)
10
               (Continued on next page)
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

| 1  | AFTERNOON SESSION  |
|----|--|
| 2  | 1:02 p.m.  |
| 3  | (In open court; jury not present)                            |
| 4  | THE COURT: Good afternoon, everyone.                         |
| 5  | Mr. Lee, you've handed up a revised slide 46.                |
| 6  | MR. LEE: That's incorrect, your Honor.                       |
| 7  | THE COURT: It is.  |
| 8  | MR. LEE: I apologize. It's an "or" for an "and." I           |
| 9  | was just fixing it and consulting with the government, and I |
| 10 | will have it fixed further.                                  |
| 11 | MS. HELLER: If the "ands" are changed to "ors," we           |
| 12 | would not object.  |
| 13 | MR. LEE: I apologize, your Honor.                            |
| 14 | THE COURT: All right. So take another shot.                  |
| 15 | MR. LEE: Yes, your Honor. Thank you.                         |
| 16 | THE COURT: All right. Mr. Dinnerstein, are you ready         |
| 17 | to proceed?  |
| 18 | MR. DINNERSTEIN: Yeah, I'm ready. I did give the             |
| 19 | I presume the government doesn't have any concerns about my  |
| 20 | PowerPoint?  |
| 21 | MR. FEE: Your Honor, we do have concerns related to          |
| 22 | three of the slides that Mr. Dinnerstein handed us before.   |
| 23 | THE COURT: Could I have a copy of those slides?              |
| 24 | MR. FEE: You want our copy? We only have the one             |
| 25 | copy.  |

Okay. I can try to do it from memory, your Honor.

These are the three about which we have an objection.

And I'll just start with the slide that's titled SA

Janice Castillo. The government's just -- some of that is

inaccurate, specifically --

THE COURT: I'll tell you what. For the ease of this, can we publish this slide so we can all look at it?

MR. DINNERSTEIN: Sure.

MR. FEE: Elmo?

THE COURT: Here.

MR. FEE: That's great.

Quick point. It's factually accurate up until "not a murder in aid of racketeering." Just -- it's the third bullet point. It's just not clear to the government if this is supposed to be something that Janice Castillo testified to, which she of course did not or would not have. And it's -- actually the same point relates to "mere presence at a crime scene not sufficient." We're just not sure how this is going to be presented.

MR. DINNERSTEIN: Your Honor, it's going to be argument. That's why it's there. It seems self-explanatory. In terms of the search warrant affidavit, the Alston murder was not part of the search warrant affidavit, so that's why that's there.

Ms. -- Agent Castillo's testimony was that, referring

24

25

to Alston, she indicated the mere presence at a crime scene not 1 sufficient. So that's why it's there. 2 3 MR. FEE: I'm not sure what --4 THE COURT: All right. To the extent that the 5 government has an objection based just on the slide, it's 6 overruled. 7 MR. FEE: Just briefly, your Honor, there's one factual inaccuracy. The search of 280 East 161, Janice 8 9 Castillo did testify about that. That's Melvin Colon's 10 residence. There were items recovered there. There were no 11 She did mention what appeared to be prescription drugs 12 and letters were recovered there. It's a minor point, your 13 Honor, but it is an inaccuracy. 14 MR. DINNERSTEIN: I'll clarify that, your Honor, when I use the slides. 15 16 THE COURT: All right. That's fine. 17 MR. FEE: Just briefly, your Honor, the next slide --18 I'm sorry -- that doesn't have the pink on it. THE COURT: It doesn't have what on it? 19 20 MR. FEE: With the pink on it. 21 THE COURT: Count Twelve? 22 MR. FEE: Count Twelve, and it lists alternate 23 theories, or alternate theory.

MR. FEE: Perhaps we could just have a proffer from

THE COURT: Right.

Mr. Dinnerstein. We're not clear if he's listing -THE COURT: Can we publish that one.

Thank you.

MR. FEE: It's titled Five Elements of the Offense, and then it lists things that are not elements of any offense that I'm aware of. They appear to be attempting to characterize theories, but it's just -- it's not legally correct.

MR. DINNERSTEIN: That's taken from the charge that you plan on giving, your Honor.

Page 109 of the charge.

MR. FEE: And my only point, your Honor -- my colleague advises me -- she understands the law better -- it's *Pinkerton*. The problem here, from the government's view, is that the title Government Alternate Theory and then Five Elements of the Offense, I mean, it's talking about *Pinkerton*, but we were just not clear on what exactly this is trying to talk about.

THE COURT: Well, I guess you'll be illumined during Mr. Dinnerstein's summation, because it seems to track the charge on *Pinkerton* liability at page 109. So the government's objection there is overruled.

MR. FEE: Finally, briefly, the title of the first page.

THE COURT: Cooperators' Storytelling?

```
MR. FEE: Yes. Storytelling is the objection, your
1
              It really goes beyond argument, to title a slide
 2
      Honor.
 3
      Cooperators' Storytelling and then to list the names.
 4
               THE COURT: All right. That objection is overruled.
 5
               MR. FEE: Thank you, your Honor.
6
               THE COURT: All right. Mr. Dinnerstein, I remind you,
 7
      as I did Mr. Fee, you'll have two hours. I'll give you a
      ten-minute warning and then a one-minute.
8
9
               MR. DINNERSTEIN: Okay. By my clock, Mr. Fee reached
10
      the ten-minute warning.
11
               THE COURT: He literally -- he turned just on the cusp
12
      of it, and had he not been concluding, I would have. But
13
      literally, he was about 30 seconds beyond.
14
               MR. DINNERSTEIN: I guess my watch was a little
15
      fast. --
               THE COURT: The ten-minute --
16
17
               MR. DINNERSTEIN: -- or maybe it just seemed to me
      like more than two hours.
18
               THE COURT: But, you see, it is amazing that even when
19
20
      the government thinks they need more time, they still can do it
21
      in less, especially when they have a week to prepare for
22
      closing arguments.
23
               So let's bring in the jury.
24
               (Jury present)
```

THE COURT: Good afternoon, members of the jury.

will continue now with closing arguments. I ask that you give your undivided attention at this time to Mitchell Dinnerstein, Esq., as he delivers his closing argument on behalf of the defendant Melvin Colon.

MR. DINNERSTEIN: Good afternoon.

THE JURORS: Good afternoon.

MR. DINNERSTEIN: Your role is the hardest one in this courtroom. We just heard a good deal from Mr. Fee about -- and I couldn't even count the number of times he used words like "absolutely true" and "reject the arguments of defense lawyers" and "you should not worry" and "the evidence is overwhelming" and "the truth is what the cooperators told you."

Those six people. The government says they're just truth tellers and you don't have to worry about it, it's really easy. It's not. Your job, ladies and gentlemen, is to figure out what the truth is. Not because Mr. Fee says it, not because I say it, or any of the other defense lawyers. You have the hardest job here because it's your job to figure out what the truth is.

Now your job is even harder, because I only have to speak about Melvin Colon, the three other lawyers are going to speak about other defendants, the government gets a chance. But your job is to deal with four separate trials with four separate sets of evidence.

The judge is going to try to help you. He's going to

Summation - Mr. Dinnerstein

tell you what the law is. He's going to tell you that these folks, the government, has a very high standard of proof. They have to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. And that those witnesses, those six people, are truth tellers, and you're supposed to believe them and believe them beyond a reasonable doubt.

Now Judge Pauley will also tell you, when he goes through the charge, one of the -- frankly, a charge that I like the best because it says all of us, everybody, the government, Mr. Colon, the rest of the defendants, the defense counsel, that we all stand equal, equal, before the bar of justice, before the law. Nobody gets a higher position. Nobody is better before the bar of justice because they work for the government, because they're prosecutors, because they're police officers, because they're special agents. We all stand, in this courtroom, equal. It's a great thing about the American system.

This case was, frankly, harder than most because we had these interruptions that I'm sure affected each one of your personal lives, the storm, and the promise that we made that we broke. We told you it was going to be a four-week trial.

We're now in the eighth week. We counted on you to fulfill your responsibility as jurors, to keep on trucking, to keep on going forward. And now we count on you even more. It's not because the government says it's all easy, it's all absolutely

true what those people said. Because we ask you to fulfill your oath, to take your responsibility — and we already know you've done this — your responsibility as citizens very seriously. We ask you now to determine what are the facts in this case and to do it fairly and as Judge Pauley tells you what the law is. You have an awesome, awesome responsibility. But our system, frankly, doesn't work because of judges or because of pretty buildings or because of prosecutors or because of defense lawyers. It works because of you and your need to follow the oath and to actually do your job, to call it the way you see it, not the way the government sees it, not the

Now you've seen a lot of people in this courtroom, and I hazard to guess that not too many of you have seen those people in your real life. The question you have to I believe answer is, how do people like that behave when they're cornered, when they're placed in a position where they're looking at spending the rest of their lives in prison, and where they are attempting to help one side so that it doesn't happen, so that they can get out from under what is, frankly, a pretty terrible situation that each one of them are in?

way defense lawyers see it, the way you see it.

Now if you notice the sign, it says Cooperators'

Storytelling. I don't call them witnesses. Witnesses are somebody who see and hear something and do not have, as these folks have, a vested interest in saying one thing or another.

Summation - Mr. Dinnerstein

When somebody is here to please one side, to get that 5K letter, to get that hope -- because that's all they got now -- of getting out of jail in their lifetime, that of course impacts on whether or not what their testimony is from that witness stand is truthful or not. A witness is somebody who's here, not necessarily because they want to be here, but because they have something to say, and nobody's putting either money in their pocket or the hope of getting out of jail in the near future.

MR. FEE: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. DINNERSTEIN: The government didn't say this word once during his summation. Those people -- I call them storytellers -- only get their deal with the government if they provide substantial assistance to the government. Does that have anything to do with telling the truth or telling lies? The government can say as many times as it chooses, as they did during their summation, these guys are truth tellers. Does any of that mean that they're truth tellers because the government says it? And what does it mean to provide substantial assistance? If you didn't see anything, if you don't know anything, you can't provide substantial assistance to making out a case against Melvin Colon.

I want to talk about somebody who's a witness and how that witness is different from somebody who is somebody who has

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summation - Mr. Dinnerstein

a vested interest in the outcome of the case, somebody who might be a storyteller, and that, frankly, is one of the things you folks are going to have to figure out. Dikeem Hill. Mr. Fee mentioned him briefly during his opening statement. I'm going to mention him because he's what a witness ought to be about. He was at his apartment in the housing projects, Melrose, and he heard gunshots. He went to the window, he saw two people running. And he told that to a police officer, not months later, not after working out some sort of deal, but the day of the shooting. And he didn't even remember what date the shooting was. And you remember there was a stipulation where we all agreed that Mr. Hill had a conversation with the police officer, Police Officer Jones, on August the 27<sup>th</sup>, 2010, which is the date that Alston was killed. Now he didn't fabricate it, he didn't exaggerate, he didn't find out what the date was. It didn't matter, because he was there to testify about what he saw and what he heard.

What did he hear? Because this tells us something about Mr. Hill as a witness and some of those cooperating storytellers. Page 3838.

"Q. And when you heard the gunshots, there were a number of gunshots, right?

> "A. Yes.

You, of course, were not counting the number of qunshots, right?

"A. No. It's an estimate."

I think he said there were eight gunshots.

"Q. Of course, the gunshots were fired one right after another, isn't that correct?

"A. Yes.

"Q. Would it be fair to say they were fired rapidly, one right after another?

"A. Yes."

Now why is that important? I'll tell you why.

Because Parsons tells us -- Parsons tells us, "Oh, we traded the gun off from one to another. We traded the gun off." And we know there was only one gun. We know that there weren't multiple guns on August 27<sup>th</sup>, 2010, because all the bullets came from a .40-caliber gun. All the shots were from a .40-caliber gun. And we know that that .40-caliber gun was fired, based on what Mr. Hill tells us, rapidly. Now I don't know how long it takes to transfer a gun from one person to another, but certainly if somebody was listening and wanted to remember carefully what he heard, he would not say rapidly if the gun is being transferred back and forth.

So now we have a question -- Mr. Fee talks about corroboration. Oh, Mr. Parsons' testimony is corroborated by all these things. Where? It's not corroborated. Actually, it's challenged. Mr. Hill says shots rapidly, Parsons says we're transferring the gun from one to another. There's

hesitation between the shootings, between the shots being fired.

MR. FEE: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. DINNERSTEIN: So you learn a lot about those six people. You learn a lot about those six people by what other people say, the other witnesses. And this one, we can call them witnesses, because they are witnesses. They're doing the best they can in terms of telling us what they remember happening. And these are the witnesses that only refer to Mr. Colon's case. There's other witnesses that refer to other people.

There's six police officers. Detective Jupiter,

McLean, Valdez, Ingoglio, Sergeant Duggal, and Detective Fox.

There's the two civilian witnesses. Mr. Hill, who we've

already heard about; Dr. Prial, who's the medical examiner

regarding the Alston murder; Shannon Chance, who works for

Facebook and flew in from California; and the two special

agents, Castillo and Collins.

So let's first talk about the murder of Alston on August 27<sup>th</sup>, 2010. Detective Jupiter, she's the crime scene unit detective. She only testified for a short time. But what she did was she recovered bullets — cartridges, not bullets, cartridges — from in front of the location where Alston was killed. And she recovered six shell casings. And she believed

Cbq1mer5

Summation - Mr. Dinnerstein

that the six shell casings — and we now know that this is actually true — that the six shell casings came from the same weapon, that there was only one weapon. And we know that because Detective Fox. Detective Fox is on the list. He's the last of the New York City police officers. And he tells us — he tells us that they come from the same gun, that there's only one gun used.

And then the other person that's relevant here is Dr. Prial. She's the medical examiner who actually performed what we call an autopsy examination. And we know -- and I'm just going to show the -- this is the body report that she did on a body, and she puts numbers 1, number 2, and number 3. Because she says -- and there's no reason to doubt it -- that Mr. Alston was shot three times and that there were six shots fired.

Now --

MR. FEE: Objection.

MR. DINNERSTEIN: -- that's what we know.

MR. FEE: Objection to six shots fired.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. DINNERSTEIN: We know that there were six shell casings at the scene and there were three shots that actually struck Mr. Alston. One in the back of the head and two in the front.

Now Parsons is their star witness. And the government

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

called Parsons, whose testimony as to this particular point is, "Oh, I'm not the shooter, although I do admit I shot four or five times. Melvin is the shooter." And the question then is -- and it's not certain, but it's -- what's the truth, what is the truth about Parsons' testimony about this significant issue? So the issue for you to first decide is, who is Parsons? Could we see --

Now this is Mr. Parsons not in a courtroom. This is where he says, "Courtlandt niggas talkin about I'm tellin on I don't call it tellin. I call it lookin out for DEV."

That's not in a courtroom where he's putting on a show, it's not in a courtroom where he wants to be a center of attention. That's just bragging to his friends about what he's doing.

Now Mr. Fee says, absolutely true. This is a guy who you're supposed to believe. Question for you, the harder one, without any bones to pick, does that make sense?

We also know something else about who Parsons is because he tells us.

Page 2567. He acknowledges that he tells people what they want to hear. Has nothing to do with whether or not it's the truth. But he tells people what they want to hear.

"Q. Well, you say on the street you told people what you thought they wanted to hear.

> "A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

67

8

9

10

11

12

1314

15

16

17

Ι/

1819

20

21

22

2324

25

"A. Yes.

right?

there was a stipulation that indicated that he was incarcerated until August  $1^{\text{St}}$  of 2010. So we know that also.

The first shooting that we know about that Parsons was involved with is Mr. Ogarro. This is the shooting that occurred, I think it's July  $31^{\rm st}$  of 2010.

This is a picture of Mr. Ogarro. And we know from Mr. Parsons that he shot him in the head. He shot him in the head while he was lying on the ground. Parsons shot him in the head. And the government does this thing like, "Oh, why would he say that? Why would he say that if it wasn't the truth?" He's into bravado. He's into showing off. He's into bragging about how many people he goes out and shoots and hurts. He's into being the center of attention. What a shocking thing for him to say. "I want to be the center of attention. I want all of you people to be looking at me. I want -- I want everybody to know that I'm the main man."

Now what does he say?

"Q. And there was a time that Mr. Ogarro had been shot and was lying on the ground, is that correct?

"A. Yes.

"And you believed he was dead, is that correct?

"A. I don't know.

"Q. So you went up to him and you shot him more,

1

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19 20
- 21
- 22
- 23 24
- 25

- Tell us what you did when you went up to him **"**O. while he was lying on the ground.
  - I stood over him and started firing. "A.
  - How far away were you when you started firing? **"**O.
  - "I was standing right over him."

And then I asked that he take a look at Government Exhibit 200, which is the shot -- this is Mr. Ogarro's body and the number of bullets that were put into him, one Mr. Parsons said he did in the middle of his forehead. I said can we have a look at Government's Exhibit 200A and --

- "Q. Now one of the bullets you put right into his head, isn't that correct, sir?
  - "A. Yes.
  - "Q. And the bullet was down into him, is that right?
  - I don't know. "A.
- And you were standing above him when you shot him "O. right in the head, is that correct?
  - "A. Yes."

That's the government's star witness. This is the one you're supposed to be absolutely sure that he's a truth teller.

But, you know, the government decided not to talk about the other shooting that Parsons did in the wild summer of 2010. I'll talk about it a little bit. He goes off sometime, he doesn't remember when, he goes off to the Maria Lopez crew because he's having some -- or houses because he's having some

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5939

Summation - Mr. Dinnerstein

rift with some guy named TA, who he, frankly, can't even remember what the rift is about. He doesn't even know why he has this rift with TA. Now government said something about being in YG and not being able to sell in the Courtlandt Avenue housing projects. That's just flat out wrong, because Parsons tells us he's a drug dealer, he sells in Courtlandt, and before he shot TA, he was a member of YG. So there isn't necessarily this -- these lines that are drawn between one group and another group. It just doesn't work quite that way. It's more amorphous than that. Somebody can be, you know, in whatever GFC is and whatever it was and whatever it became while Melvin is sitting in prison, and YGs, who some of the -- some are -they're the same members. They're the same people. So it isn't accurate for Mr. Fee to get up here and say, oh, these are different people, different gangs. This guy, Parsons, tells us he's in GFC, he's in something called GFM, which is I guess a Harlem group, and he's in YG, all at the same time. And we know that Parsons shoots people that have nothing to do with racketeering, with an enterprise. He just does it because he wants to. He's that sort of quy. And we know that because he tells us.

This -- by the way, here's a picture of TA.

He tells us why he goes over there.

"Q. We had problems before. Who did you have problems with?

Case 1:11-cr-00576-PKC Document 360 Filed 12/18/12 Page 114 of 216 5940 Cbq1mer5 Summation - Mr. Dinnerstein Me and TA, we had problems before. 1 "A. What was the nature of the problem you had with 2 "Q. 3 TA? 4 "A. Huh? 5 What was the nature of the problem you had with TA before? 6 7 I don't even remember." He shoots a guy in the stomach, he doesn't even 8 9 remember what the issue is about. 10 "O. Was it because he took a bell? "A. 11 No. 12 "Q. Was it because -- it's your testimony now, sir, 13 that you had a problem with TA but you can't remember, is that 14 correct?" 15 I'm kind of flabbergasted. You can't remember why you 16 shot somebody? 17 "A. Yes. 18 Was it a personal problem or was it a problem with YGs? 19 20 It was personal. "A. 21 So there was some personal matter with TA, is

that correct?

"A. Yes."

22

23

24

25

Well, he goes on.

This has to do with -- the reason he shot him was

Cbq1mer5

Summation - Mr. Dinnerstein

because he punched him, so TA -- of course Parsons brings a gun 1 over there just in case, but -- but TA punches him and he 2 3 decides he has to shoot him. What did he do?" Talking about TA. 4 **"**O. 5 "A. He punched me in my face. 6 "O. He pushed you? 7 "A. No. He punched me. And you decided to shoot him? 8 "Q. 9 "A. Yes. 10 "You decided to shoot him in the chest, right? 11 "A. Yes. 12 "O. What was the reason you decided to shoot him in the chest? 13 14 Because he punched me. "A. 15 "Q. Did you hope to hurt him? "A. 16 Yes. 17 What did you hope to do? "Q. "A. Kill him. 18 "Q. That's because he punched you, you were going to 19 20 kill him, right? "A. Yeah." 21 22 Star witness. 23 And then that wasn't enough that he just shot TA 24 because he punched him. He had a gun with lots of bullets. 25

he emptied the gun.

2549.

2

3 that gun, is that correct?

4

"A. Yes.

5

6

"Q. You shot everybody, you just shot randomly in the neighborhood, is that correct?

"At that point, after you shot TA, you then emptied

7

"A. Everybody that was with him.

8

"Q. What?

9

"Everybody that was with him."

10

11

Mr. Parsons doesn't need help shooting people. He shoots people. He takes guns and he shoots them, and he

12

doesn't need a crowd. He doesn't need Melly or anybody else to

13

shoot people. He does it on his own.

him. This is Parsons' testimony.

1415

takes his gun, he fills it up with bullets, and this guy, White

And what does he do then? Well, he goes back home, he

16

Mike he's called, White Mike goes over from the Maria Lopez

17

housing, across the street, really, it's not very far, over to

18

Jackson and Melrose, and he's talking to somebody, and it's

1920

like he's talking to find out what the heck happened. He doesn't come with a crew. He doesn't come with a gang. He

21

comes by himself.

22

And what does Parsons do? What does he do? He shoots

2324

"Because they were arguing and you heard your name,

25

you then shot them, is that correct?" I think it should be

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summation - Mr. Dinnerstein Cbq1mer5

shot him, because he only shot one person. 1

> "A. Yes.

**"**O. Basically that's all that happens, right?

"A. Yes.

You just pulled out the gun and shot him.

"A. Yes.

"You shot him right in the head, right?

"A. Yes.

"What was your hope when you shot him in the head?

"A. For him to die.

**"**O. What?

"For him to die.

"That you would kill him, right?

"Yeah.

"Because you shoot somebody in the head, you expect that the person's going to die, is that correct?

"Yes."

Wow. But what else is significant about that? Parsons shoots him in the back of the head. He shoots White Mike in the back of the head. Ogarro he shoots in the front of the head. He shoots him while he's on the ground and right into the head. And we know that whatever number of days it is, whatever period of time is between the shooting of White Mike and TA, and the shooting of Black -- we know how Alston also gets shot, in the back of the head, back right side of the

head, just like White Mike. Parsons seems to like to shoot people in the back of the head.

So now we're up to the Alston shooting. And we know the date that happens. August 27<sup>th</sup>, 2010. And we know some of the things from some of those witnesses. We know, for instance, that there was only one gun. We know that there were six shots that were fired. We know that three of those six shots hit Black, and we know that Parsons tells us that he's involved in — that he shoots four or five times. That's what he tells us on the witness stand, that he does at least — he says four or five shots. We know the man's only hit three times, and we also know that Parsons at this point, in his wild summer of 2010, we know has already been involved in four shootings.

Now the first question you have to decide is whether or not the shooting of Alston is done as an enterprise act.

This is Count Eight of the indictment. And there's three elements of this count:

1. There existed an enterprise called the Courtlandt Avenue Crew engaged in racketeering activity.

Now that's something for you to decide, and I think a lot of the other lawyers are going to talk about this, and I'm not going to spend a lot of time talking about whether there is such a thing as a Courtlandt Avenue Crew. Nobody ever called it that. Nobody ever figured out who the members were. But

Cbq1mer5

Summation - Mr. Dinnerstein

the government says, this is it. It's the Courtlandt Avenue

Crew. Some of the guys were in GFC, some of them weren't.

Some of them I guess could also be in the Courtlandt Avenue

Crew and also in the YGs, like Parsons, at least for some point in time. But I don't know. Does it exist? I know that a lot of the other lawyers are going to talk about that, so I'm not going to use my time talking about it.

Melvin Colon -- second element -- murdered or aided and abetted the murder of Delquan Alston.

So the government now has kind of two different theories at this point, because either he -- Melvin could have been the one, the trigger person -- I think there's lots of question as to whether or not Parsons is actually the trigger person and shot all the time. Or that somehow he aided and abetted the murder of Mr. Alston.

And then the third count, this idea of gaining entrance to and increasing your position in the racketeering really turns -- comes back to the first charge. And then you have to accept the idea that the shooting of Alston somehow was going to enhance his position in this racketeering crew, whether or not such a thing actually exists.

(Continued on next page)

and Melly shoot Alston is because he's directed to do so by

2

5946

1 MR. DINNERSTEIN: Parsons tells us that the reason he

- 3 T-Money. These are questions that Ms. Heller asked when
- 4 Parsons was on the stand:
- 5 "Q. Mr. Parsons, when we left off yesterday, you were talking
- 6 about a conversation in the chicken spot, do you remember?
- 7 | "A. Yes.
- 8 "Q. What was the result of the conversation in the chicken 9 spot?
- 10 "A. We was talking about Black.
- 11 "Q. Just to summarize, what was the final results when you
- 12 | left the chicken spot, what had you be been asked to do?
- 13 | "A. We agreed to the conversation that we was talking about.
- 14 "Q. What did you agree to do?
- 15 | "A. That he told us he wanted to us get rid of him."
- Okay, "he" being T-Money. "Him" being Blacks or
- 17 | Alston.
- 18 "Q. Can you use names?
- 19 | "A. It was me, Melly and T-Money in the chicken spot.
- 20 | "Q. What had the three of you agreed to do?
- 21 "A. He told us what to do and we agreed to do it. We agreed
  22 to killing Blacks."
- Well, this is crazy. This isn't what happened. It is impossible to believe that that is what happened. When Mr. Fee
- 25 says, oh, it's just common sense, it's not common sense.

CBQ3MER6

tell us that.

Summation - Mr. Dinnerstein

- Because we know in August of 2010 that T-Money was upset over
  the violence that Parsons was perpetrating. He was upset that
  Parsons was shooting people. And we know that because Parsons
- "Q. After this shooting" now we are talking about the White

  Mike shooting "you had a conversation with T-Money, isn't that
  correct?
- 8 | "A. Yes.

4

- 9 "Q. And he was telling you that all these shootings that are
  10 occurring in the Melrose Houses are affecting business, is that
  11 correct?
- 12 | "A. Yes.
- "Q. And that what's going on is because all those shootings, the cops were around, is that correct?
- 15 | "A. Yes.
- 16 | "Q. And he told you to get out of town, right?
- 17 | "A. Yes.
- "Q. And he told you to get out of town because you were hot,
  "ght?"
- 20 | "A. Yes.
- 21 "Q. You were telling people that you were shooting people, 22 right?
- 23 | "A. I probably told some people that.
- "Q. Actually, you told people because you were kind of proud of the idea you were killing people, isn't that correct, sir?

- 1 "A. I probably did tell them when I was drunk.
- 2 "Q. Did you tell them you were proud that you were shooting at people?
- 4 "A. No.
- 5 "Q. Did you tell them -- did you think by shooting people that would make you the center of attention?
- 7 | "A. Yes." We get that theme again.
- 8 | "Q. You liked being the center of attention, right?
- 9 | "A. At that time I did.
- "Q. You liked by shooting people you get to become the center of attention, isn't that right?
- 12 "A. Yes.
- "Q. T-Money said stop shooting people because the cops are around and it's hurting business, isn't that correct?
- 15 | "A. I don't remember him saying that.
- "Q. Well, T-Money was concerned that there was so much
  violence going on in the Melrose and Jackson Houses, right?
- 18 "A. Yes.
- "Q. And he was concerned that there were all these shootings,
  "I right?"
- 21 | "A. Yes."

22 Why would T-Money ask Parsons to shoot Alston? He's
23 not a player. I mean, you can kind of understand why Ogarro
24 got shot, because he's involved with a rival drug gang,
25 supposedly. You can kind of understand why Correa got shot,

because he's involved with a rival drug group. But Blacks?
Who's he? He's just some guy who sells crack. Maybe bad
crack. But that's not a reason to shoot somebody. You tell
him to stop doing it. But you don't kill him over that.

I submit that the shooting of Alston, the shooting of Black, was an independent act by this sociopath Parsons for whatever reason. We know that first because what the government is trying to sell here violates our common sense that somehow this has something to do with business and therefore part of this enterprise.

But because Villafranco tells us what happens. He tells us that he had received a gun at some point prior to August 27, from Dev Parsons and Akon. It was the two of them. Melly had nothing to do with this gun being at this guy's house. And on August 27, Dev comes back to get the gun. And he says that Dev comes to his house at 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning on August the 27th, and he says to him — this is Villafranco being on the stand:

- "Q. Tell us about what happened that day.
- "A. Devin Parsons came to my house about three or four in the morning. I was asleep. He knocking on the door, on my door and I opened the door and he asked for the gun.
- "Q. Do you remember how he asked for the gun?
- 24 | "A. Let me get that. And then he says let me get that joint.
  - "Q. What did you know -- what was your understanding of the

CBQ3MER6 Summation - Mr. Dinnerstein

1 | word "joint"?

"A. Gun."

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

22

23

24

25

Now we know that Devin when he comes to the house is angry. And because right after that, I asked Villafranco this:

- "Q. What was his demeanor like at the time?
- 6 | "A. Like, like he was rushing. Like he was angry.
  - "Q. Was Dev with anyone at that time?
    - "A. No, he was not."

So we know that Dev was angry. We also know from Villafranco something that we all know anyway. That Parsons is a crazy, selfish, wild, violent person. There is no question about that. Now, we also know that Melly never tells Villafranco anything about the shooting. He never makes any admissions. He never says, oh, I did it. But we know what Parsons tells Villafranco. 3524.

- 16 "Q. Did you give Dev the gun?
- 17 | "A. Yes, I did.
- 18 "Q. Was Dev with anyone else at the time?
- 19 "A. No, he was by hisself.
- 20 | "Q. Once you gave the gun to Dev, where did he put it?
- 21 | "A. He put it on his waist."

So this idea that Dev who testifies, oh, I can't put the gun in my waist because it would fall out, we know from Villafranco that wasn't true.

"Q. Did you have a conversation with Dev about what had

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 1 happened at that time?" This is now after the shooting.
- 2 | "A. After we left the apartment, we was walking on Courtlandt
- 3 by the chicken spot, and he had told me that him and Melly had
- 4 | killed Black.
  - "Q. Do you remember the words he used to describe that?
- 6 | "A. He said that he flocked Black.
  - "Q. What's your understanding of the term flocked?
  - "A. He killed him."

He didn't say Melly killed him. He said he, Dev, killed him. There is something else to be said about this because we know that Parsons is a liar, and lies to people all the time when it serves his purpose. He tells us that. We know from Defendant's Exhibit 6 that he's out to help himself here. That's what he tells us. And you're now supposed to believe it's supposed to be absolutely certain, like the government tells you, that Melvin was involved in that shooting. That he participated in that shooting. That he either shot, or at least if they can't prove that, that he somehow aided and abetted the murder of Blacks. Because Castillo says so. Excuse me, because Parsons says so.

We know also that Parsons admits to taking four or five shots. There is only three shots in Blacks, and we know also that his signature shooting is in the back of the head. That's how he shot White Mike, and that's how he shot Black. We know that there is only one gun and that gun is an

automatic. And we know that an automatic gets to be shot rapidly, and we know that the shots were fired because both Hill and Villafranco tell us rapidly.

I want to say one thing about an argument that the government made about the height, the relative heights of people. Now, this shooting occurred two years ago. August of 2010. More than two years ago. Melvin was 18 then. Now he's 20. Kids grow. So to suggest that he's the same height in 2012 when Castillo says, oh, he's 6 feet tall and, therefore, the conclusion is he was 6 feet tall in 2010, we don't know that. And we also don't know that when somebody is urinating as Blacks is supposed to do, especially when you are a little bit tipsy, whether or not you're standing as Mr. Fee said upright. Maybe he's not standing totally upright. Maybe he's leaning a little bit. Dr. Prial can't tell us how exactly that person was standing.

So the idea that the shooting occurred by Melly because two years later he's a different height than he was in 2010, is just trying too hard. Because it doesn't prove anything.

I want to talk a little bit about Crocker at this point. Because Crocker, if you remember, he is an early, early cooperator. He actually is talked to by the government on the date of his arrest on September 27, 2011. And the government is very anxious to have him as a cooperator. This was the

CBQ3MER6

Summation - Mr. Dinnerstein

- questioning of him regarding his initial discussion of him being a cooperator:
- 3 "Q. When you got arrested on September 27, you immediately had a conversation with the government agents, is that correct?
- 5 Na. Right.
- "Q. That was on the same day that everybody else was arrested,
  right?
- 8 | "A. Right.

9

- "Q. You had a lawyer at that time, right?
- 10 | "A. Yeah, I had a lawyer
- 11 "Q. You had Mr. Quijano, right?
- 12 | "A. Right.
- 13 | "Q. He was representing you from September 27, right?
- 14 | "A. Right.
- "Q. You were not arraigned with -- you did not see the judge with everybody else, isn't that correct?
- 17 | "A. Correct.
- 18 "Q. You saw the judge separately, right?
- 19 | "A. Right.
- 20 "Q. You on that date had a conversation about cooperating,
- 21 | right?
- 22 | "A. Right.
- 23 "Q. And that was the first date that you were arrested along
- 24 | with everyone else, right?
- 25 | "A. Right."

Why is that significant? Because Crocker knows he's going to be a cooperator and he decides to cooperate very early on in the game. He's cooperating by October or November of 2011. He is cooperating at that point and he is going to participate in the government's case and he understands that he has to provide the government with substantial assistance. That's what this is all about. He knows he's in big trouble, he's being prosecuted in a federal courtroom. He knows he is charged with all sorts of horrible things, and he knows that if he cooperates, he's got to be able to tell the government something that's going to help him and give him this 5K letter and this substantial assistance.

We also know he's a little different from the other people because Crocker was the fellow who was in jail in 2010, at Rikers Island. And when he was in jail, he knew that they were already interested in him because they came to talk to him. And he knows that and he tells us that. He tells us that he gets recruited from Rikers Island, they talked to him then, this is April of 2010, he speaks with a Detective Harris, Agent Castillo tells us that she talks to him at that point, and that there is discussion about whether or not Crocker, who is also known as 14, is going to come and cooperate with the government. He says no.

But in September of 2011 he knows he is being arrested, he knows he's being charged with very serious crimes,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

15

5955

- and he changes his mind. And he knows at that point that he better have something to give the government that would be substantial assistance in this case. So what does he tell them? He tells them, because he doesn't know, he's never told anything about the shooting until he finds out that the government is interested in charging Melly with the Alston killing. And what Crocker tells us is this. This is direct examination by whichever lawyer it was who was questioning Mr. Crocker at this time:
- Did you ever speak to Melly about the murder of Black?
- "A. 11 Yes.
- 12 "O. When did you speak to Melly about this?
- "A. 13 I spoke to him when we got arrested in MDC." By that 14 time, Crocker already knows he's going to cooperate.
  - **"**O. After your arrest by federal authorities?
- 16 "A. Yes." Then he goes on.
- 17 What did Melly say at that time about the murder of Black?
- 18 He was saying the same thing Dev told me in the -- in
- 19 the -- and the reason why he had the gun behind his head so
- 20 long, because he was about to catch his first murder, and when
- 21 he shot him in the head, Black turned around and looked at him
- 22 in the eyes. And it was -- and it was scary that he shot him
- again." 23
- 24 This actually is something Mr. Fee put up there on the
- 25 wall. But it didn't happen that way. It couldn't have

Summation - Mr. Dinnerstein

happened that way. Because of what Hill and Villafranco tells us. Because they say the shots are rapid. Crocker now tells us the shots couldn't be that rapid. Because the fellow had an opportunity to turn around and got shot some more, and then we still don't know about those three other shots because we know those occurred because the shell casings are there on the ground.

What we know is that Crocker needs to get his 5K letter, he needs to get substantial assistance, and the truth is not the issue here. The issue is how can he be helpful to the government so that he can be on their team. So that he can get help from them. He tells a really good story about the shooting. He needs to. He needs to make it convincing. So it is the first murder and the turn around and the being scared and all that sort of stuff. But Hill and Villafranco tell us that's not what happened. Shots were rapid. Crocker has a long story between shots. Can't be so.

Let's see Castillo. Janice Castillo is a special agent for Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearm. I want to talk about three things that she testifies about which indicates substantial problems with the government's case.

First, a search warrant. Now, it says there was a search warrant affidavit in March of 2011 at 2253 Haviland Avenue which is Joshua Meregildo. She doesn't -- and you remember the affidavit is something that she needs to fill out

CBQ3MER6

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Summation - Mr. Dinnerstein

5957

because she needs the judge to sign it. And she needs to put the details of why she needs that search warrant into that particular house. And she tells you she wants to make sure that it's thorough. The affidavit ought to be thorough and it ought to have a lot of information on it so that the judge is going to sign the affidavit.

Now, at that point in March of 2011, there were three cooperators, Aponte, Villafranco and Parsons. And there was Crocker who they had already spoken to over at the Rikers Island. And supposedly, Parsons and Villafranco are aware of the Alston killing. Parsons was involved and gave the story about why they killed him and claims that Melly was involved in the killing also. It wasn't put in that affidavit. It wasn't put in that affidavit because, I submit, at that time, what the government believed, what Castillo believed, was that Parsons committed the shooting for his own reasons. The reason he killed Blacks had nothing to do with an enterprise, had nothing to do with T-Money or anything like that. He did it because he felt like it. What does Castillo say?

- "Q. You mentioned the homicide of Correa, is that correct?
- 21 | "A. Yes.
- 22 "Q. You mentioned the homicide of Ogarro, isn't that correct?"
- 23 | That's talking about what she put into the affidavit.
- 24 | "A. Yes.
- 25 | "Q. Because those were murders in aid of racketeering, isn't

- 1 that correct?
- 2 "A. Yes.
- 3 "Q. And you also mentioned that Terry Harrison was murdered,
- 4 isn't that correct?" Because by that time Harrison was
- 5 murdered in September of 2010.
- "A. Yes. 6
- 7 "Q. Did you mention the murder of Delquan Alston in that
- 8 affidavit?
- 9 "Α. No.
- 10 Now you had spoken to the cooperating witnesses, isn't
- 11 that correct?
- 12 "A. Yes.
- 13 And you wanted this affidavit to be complete as possible, **"**O.
- 14 isn't that correct?
- "A. Yes." 15
- So, we now know that in March of 2011, when they got 16
- the search warrant affidavit, they neglected to mention the 17
- murder of Blacks, the murder of Alston. They mentioned Ogarro, 18
- they mentioned Correa, but Blacks they don't mention. 19
- 20 And then comes to the second point of Agent Castillo's
- testimony. They conduct a search of 280 East 161st Street, 21
- 22 apartment 6U where Ms. Keon lives along with Melvin. Why did
- 23 they do that? Because the great cooperators say, oh, that's
- 24 where all the drugs are, that's where all the guns are. All
- you have to do is walk into Melly's apartment and you're going 25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to find all sorts of guns and drugs.

Now, Melly got arrested. He wasn't at that apartment. He was at a guy named Dante Barber's apartment at 321 East 156th Street I think. There were numerous people who were also there. Lots of them were not even arrested. There were adults that were there, there was a person by the name of Vic. He was There was a person by the name of David Cooper, he was there. there. There was somebody by the name of Aponte, who was also by the way one of the cooperators early on in this case. was a lot of talk about him but we didn't get to see him. they find in that apartment a small amount of crack cocaine in a glass case, and they find one gun. Whose gun is it? We don't know. We know it was found in Dante Barber's bedroom. The government doesn't have the chutzpah I guess to stand up here and say, oh, that gun belonged to Melly. Because nobody Nobody knows whose gun that actually was. We don't know.

But what we do know is right after that search, right after the arrest of Melly and those other people who were arrested and the people who were not arrested like Aponte, that Castillo goes to 280 East 161st Street and he meets Melly's mother there. And he tells Melly's mother what's going on. Your son's being arrested on a federal charge. And she acts the way we all would act. She's upset. She's crying. And Castillo isn't there just to provide information to Melly's

1 mom.

mom. He's there -- she's there to search the apartment. And she has a couple of other agents with her. Because the cooperators say, oh, you are going to find a lot of guns and drugs there. That's where the stash is. And she doesn't even have a search warrant. Not exactly sure why she doesn't get a search warrant, but she doesn't have a search warrant. She asks her mom, can we search? Would you let us search without a search warrant? Would you give us consent to search the house? Search the room? Search the apartment? Search the place that Melly sleeps? Sure. Search away. See what you find.

And what do they find? They find a couple of letters that they take, although we never know anything about those letters. It isn't talked about. We find a medicine bottle. And what don't we find? We don't find guns, and we don't find drugs.

So, again, an opportunity to corroborate what the cooperators tell us, no corroboration. The words of those six people that we saw at the beginning, no corroboration.

Finally, Agent Castillo tells us that just being merely present at a crime scene is not enough to be guilty. So the fact that if you believe that Melly was present when Parsons shot that guy, when Parsons shot Alston, doesn't make him guilty unless he is either the murderer, or he's aiding and abetting.

And what I submit we know about the murder is that

Summation - Mr. Dinnerstein

Parsons gets the gun, is angry, goes out, shoots somebody, shoots Alston, and then returns the gun. And Melly, who is standing there at that time, runs with him. That's what we know. Mere presence is not enough. And Castillo tells us that. Not just will Judge Pauley tell us that. But when Castillo is talking about Aponte, who you remember was present when Pemberton shot that Chinese delivery man, he's asked questions by Mr. Lee, actually, whether or not Aponte is guilty of being involved in that Pemberton shooting. And what does Agent Castillo say?

- "Q. Did you see Mr. Aponte on the bicycle riding there right at the time of the shooting?
- 13 | "A. Yes." Then he goes on to say:
  - "Q. But he was involved." Talking about Aponte. And Agent Castillo's answer was he was present.

There is difference, and the law says and Judge Pauley will tell us that being present is different from being involved.

So, how then, still talking about the August 27 incident, can Melly be held responsible for the conduct of Parsons? At best, he was present. Not going to challenge what Villafranco says about that. But there is certainly no evidence, certainly no evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that he can be held responsible for Parsons' murder of Alston in the back of the head.

CDQJIIII

Let's now talk about a few of the other counts.

Assault and attempted murder in aid of racketeering of

Mr. Jiang. That's an incident that happened September 8 of

2011, about a year after a lot of these other incidents

happened. The government has in this case, we'll talk about

both of them because I think they're asking you to do an

either/or sort of thing. They have two theories. And we can

go to the next slide. One that he somehow aided and abetted

the shooting of Mr. Jiang, and there is another one and we'll

talk about it a little bit that's a little more complicated,

it's called co-conspirator liability.

We know what happened on September 8, the government cooperator, Aubrey Pemberton, decides to shoot in the Maria Lopez housing area and that he hits Mr. Jiang. At the beginning we know that that happened because Police Officer Ingoglio, he's one of the officers, he's the one who was on the evidence collection team. He found shell casings just like they found shell casings when Detective Jupiter found shell casings on August 27. Ingoglio also found shell casings. We learned from Detective Fox, the other government witness, the ballistics expert, that the shell casings all come from one gun. And we know who shot that one gun. Pemberton.

So the only issue really is, is whether or not

Pemberton and Melly had this conversation where Melly says, oh,

I'll shoot four times, you shoot four times. And then

Pemberton gets too excited so he shoots all eight times.

Well, to accept that, as to count 12, this count, the government has to convince you that that conversation actually happened. And there is only one person who could tell you whether or not that happened based upon the evidence in this courtroom, and that's Pemberton. And I submit at this point, we know what Pemberton is interested in. He's interested in getting from the government a 5K letter, and he knows the only way he gets such a letter is to provide them with substantial assistance. So he has a very large incentive in demonizing Melly, in saying a bad thing about him. He doesn't get his 5K letter unless he does that.

So let's go to the second theory. I guess the government may have problems with this idea of whether or not you're going to believe Pemberton to the point of thinking that he aided and abetted the shooting. This theory is called co-conspirator liability theory. Lots of big words. And there is five elements to this offense and the judge is going to tell you this. First, he's going to tell you that someone assaulted or attempted to murder Jing Bao Jiang. And Mr. Fee actually correctly said that you can transfer the intent. If you intend to shoot one person but you actually shoot someone else, that transferred intent is properly within the elements of the particular count. Two, three and four all deal with being either a member of a conspiracy, we'll talk about that a little

racketeering in some sort of manner.

But the fifth theory, the fifth element of this

bit later, or whether or not this shooting was in aid of

particular count talks about Melvin Colon could reasonably have foreseen that one or more of the co-conspirators, in this case Pemberton, might commit the assault or attempted murder. Okay. So they're hedging their bets on the aided and abetted stuff, and they are saying all we have to do is prove it was reasonably foreseeable. Well, that only presupposes that Mr. Colon, that Melvin, knew what Pemberton was going to do. And then, remember Aponte? Because Aponte's present on September the 8th too. Is Aponte guilty under this theory? I guess not for Agent Castillo's purposes. Not for the government purposes.

MR. FEE: Objection, your Honor. Facts not in evidence.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. DINNERSTEIN: How then can it be reasonably foreseeable when the evidence that Melly knew that Pemberton was going to be such a lunatic at about 7:30, 8 o'clock at night on September 8 that he was going to go out and pull out a gun and shoot randomly at people.

Now, let's go to PowerPoint 7, the next one. Go to the next one. This is count 11 of the indictment. Boy, you guys have a hard job putting all this stuff together. I just

have to talk about Melvin Colon. Okay. The judge is going to tell you what conspiracy is. Okay.

And why is it one, one? Okay. It should be one, two, three. Okay.

THE COURT: Scrivener's error.

MR. DINNERSTEIN: The second one, Melvin Colon conspired to murder members of the Maria Lopez crew from August of 2010 to September of 2011. That's about 13 months. Well, I'm not going to talk too much about that, but during that 13-month period of time, some of that period of time, based on the stipulation, Melvin Colon wasn't even around. But that's neither here nor there.

What we, and this is something I have a lot of question about, whether or not what Mr. Fee said was right that there is no serious dispute that Mr. Colon went to the Maria Lopez housing projects on a fairly regular basis. That's what Crocker says, once or twice a week, and that they shoot up the place. I have a serious question as to whether or not that in fact is true.

We know about two shootings. We know that Pemberton shooting when he shot Mr. Jiang, count 12 of the indictment.

And we know that at one time, Folks shot Melly in the back. So we know that there were two shootings that occurred in the Maria Lopez housing. Do we know if there is lots of them?

Because the government cooperators tell us that they go over

there all the time and they shoot the place up? Actually, I think we know precisely the opposite. That those guys are making up stuff to help themselves. And we know that because all we have to do is listen to the words of the police officers who tell us that when shots are fired, they conduct an investigation. When there is a radio run from those good people who live in this community, when there is a call saying there are shots being fired at the Maria Lopez Houses, police are going to conduct an investigation. It's going to happen

When there is a report, when someone calls the police and you heard some of those radio runs of shots being fired, the police conduct an investigation.

every time. It will happen on Park Avenue in Manhattan. And

it will happen on Park Avenue in the Bronx.

And we know Police Officer Valdez, and he's the one who investigated when Folks shot Melly in the back, April 26, 2011, that he received a radio run of shots being fired, he went to investigate, he found cartridges. Not from two guns. Not from 10 guns. But from one gun. And we know who had that one gun. Folks. Not Melly.

They can try to demonize Melly and say, oh, he shot too. But then Police Officer Valdez, a competent and good cop, would have found him. But he didn't.

And then I spoke a little bit about this before, the September 8 shooting where Mr. Jiang was shot. They found

Shell casings from one gun. And we know who did that shooting. Pemberton. And then there is Police Officer Duggal, and Melly wasn't even there, but she's talking about an incident where I guess Mr. Joseph was shot, Lincoln Hospital, September 13, 2010, a year before. She didn't know anybody was shot. But there was a report of shots fired and she went to conduct an investigation. That's what the police do.

And then there's Officer McLean. Sergeant McLean. She was present, she was the first officer at the scene on the August 27, 2010, shooting where Alston was killed. She went there not because she knew about anybody being shot or killed. She went there because shots were fired. Shots fired, police investigation. That's what happens every time.

Crocker tells us once or twice a week they go over and shoot up that particular housing complex. Folks tells us, Pemberton tells us, Parsons tells us. Oh, we know, by the way, there's two other shootings at Maria — one other shooting at Maria Lopez. We knows Parsons goes over there because he has a beef with TA and he shoots him. It's not part of any enterprise. That's just some wild thing this kid decides to do.

So I have a serious dispute whether or not people from Jackson Melrose, Melly Colon, went over there on a regular basis and shot the place up. There is no evidence in this courtroom about that, other than the storytellers who are

CBQ3MER6

Summation - Mr. Dinnerstein

looking to get out from under, get their 5K letter, provide substantial assistance.

So that gets us -- I'm getting there. Hagen.

Mr. Johnny-come-lately. One of the things you have to wonder about, what the heck is he doing in this case. They got five cooperators. It's not enough? They have to bring in

Mr. big-time Bloods guy in from Newburgh? Because there is no way that we can or anybody can corroborate anything this guy says. He's just saying it. He doesn't tape record anything. There is nobody else who hears except for the other maybe cooperators. Who knows.

(Continued on next page)

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

1011

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

2223

24

25

MR. DINNERSTEIN: I don't know why they brought him to court. November 9<sup>th</sup>, two, three weeks ago, after the storm, they cut a deal with him, where he gets -- where the deal says, in his cooperation agreement, 55-year minimum sentence, but maybe now he can get a couple of years.

MR. FEE: Objection, your Honor. Mischaracterizing the evidence.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. DINNERSTEIN: He shows up to testify on Veterans
Day, two days after he gets his cooperation agreement, I guess
to fix the case.

Now you can -- maybe the government will say, well, you can ignore all those other cooperators. You can believe him. He's older, he's a little savvier, a little smarter. Does that make him truthful? Don't think so. Remember what his nickname is? Vision. And he tells you how he got the nickname. It's worth talking about.

I asked him this question:

"Your nickname is Vision?

"A. Yes.

"Q. How did you get such a nickname?

"A. The guy -- actually, it was a joke at first. I was in jail and we used to talk about numerous things that would go in the street, and I was around a bunch of older guys and they used to pick on me all the time and say, There's not

too much you haven't seen yet. I'm going to start calling you Vision. And it stuck."

That's not what "vision" means. "Vision" doesn't mean you can see in the past. "Vision" means you can see in the future. That's what "vision" means. You have a good imagination. "Something seen in a dream, trance, or ecstasy; especially: a supernatural appearance that conveys a revelation."

"A thought, concept, or object formed by the imagination."

There's a book written by Edith Wharton, I don't know if you know it, The Age of Innocence. "Look not at visions but at realities." I'll tell you what his vision is. He's in a -- he's in a desert. He's parched, he's thirsty, he's dying. He sees what he believes is water, his salvation. He's going to be okay. He's going to go to that water and he's going to drink. He gets closer, it's only a mirage. There isn't any water. The vision that he saw, his imagination saw an oasis, but it wasn't real. It wasn't there. There's water at this table. And he needs to tell the story. He's going to go after the guys from Newburgh. "But let me make the story better.

I'll go after Melly." He wants to provide substantial assistance.

It is easy to get information in prison. He tells you how easy it is. People go over their cases. We call it

discovery. It makes perfectly good sense, because people who are going to go to trial look at the evidence against them.

But it's not a private space. It's a public space. He sits there by the microwave and he hears what these people are saying. He understands, because he is smart, that what he has to do is he has to demonize Melly. He has to talk about how he's joking about the evidence. You don't have to be a rocket scientist to figure out that's what's important.

We know that there isn't a way in hell that there's any evidence in this courtroom that corroborates a word of what Hagen says. We know that Hagen can stand behind the table there Melly and the co-defendants are working at or whomever is there and listen to what's going on. He can use his imagination. He's smart enough to know what to say when he sits down and talks to the prosecutors. He has a vision. His vision is to get a 5K letter and to hopefully get himself out of jail.

Now we know also that Hagen is somebody good at observing. And it's a very -- seems like a point that he may have actually put past people. Mr. Miedel asked Hagen, when given an opportunity -- but it tells us something about who Hagen is and his ability to make observations.

He's talking about a guy named Akon, which is a nickname for Folks, okay? Folks. Okay. And he says -- these are questions Mr. Miedel is asking.

20

21

22

23

24

25

5972

|    | Cbq1mer7       | Summation - Mr. Dinnerstein                           |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|----|----------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1  |                | "Q. She also asked you whether you were ever housed   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2  | with a gr      | ay named Akon, right?" She being Ms. Heller.          |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3  |                | "A. Yes.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4  |                | "Q. You said you had not been housed or together with |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5  | a guy nai      | med Akon, right?                                      |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6  |                | "A. Yes.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7  |                | "But in fact you spent time with Akon in a bullpen    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8  | once, correct? |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9  |                | "A. Yeah. Somebody I presume to be him, yes."         |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 |                | How he knows that, who knows.                         |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 |                | "Q. Somebody that you knew him to be him, right?      |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 |                | "A. No. I never talked to him."                       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 |                | He knows cooperators aren't supposed to talk to one   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | another.       |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 |                | "I never had any conversation with him. I just        |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | presumed       | that was him because of the GFC tattoo he had on his  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | arm."          |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 |                | What does that say about Hagen? He is perceptive.     |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |                |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |

He's going to put that in the back of his brain and try to figure out if there's a place that he can use that. So when he comes to court, he's asked questions about Akon, says, oh, yeah, I made observations about him. I presumed that this was connected to these other guys.

When Hagen testified in this courtroom, he was trying to impress you. His demeanor was calm, he was relaxed.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5973

He was not going to be somebody who was going to suggest a different side of him. He tells us stories that probably aren't true. He gets into some sort of altercation with his girlfriend on the street and he didn't do anything wrong. was just this overreaction on the part of the police. Well, who knows. I would probably accept the cop over him.

And he spends a lot of time minimizing his own criminal conduct. He's the leader of the Bloods but, you know, he's just trying to keep order.

And we know that he's capable of lying. Remember, he's the one that the FBI agents came over to his house and --I think November, and they had a conversation about some murder that occurred in Newburgh, and he looked them right in the face and spoke calmly, he said just the way he speaks -- spoke in this courtroom, and he lied to them. Then he had this conversation with this US attorney named Maimin, did the same thing. He lied to him.

So that's the government's storyteller.

And there's one more witness -- there's a couple more people that I want to talk about.

Special Agent Collins.

Now the government says, well, you don't have to believe any of the cooperators. All you have to do is believe those Facebook entries, those tattoos, those pictures, the 3,089 pages on Facebook. Why kids have these videotape.

enormous Facebook accounts, I don't know. That's what

Ms. Chance -- she's the one from Facebook -- tells us. And the
government shows a few pages and says, See? See? See? He's
guilty. He's guilty. He's guilty.

What's Facebook? It's social networking. It is a place that kids seem to be on all over the place, and it is a place where kids use it for bravado, for exaggeration. It's theater. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt because of some Facebook pictures? Really? Is that really enough? We've been here eight weeks, and what they come up with is a few Facebook pictures and say find him guilty because of that? Kids acting jerky is not a substitute for evidence in a federal courthouse.

You have to look at where Melly comes from -- a hard, difficult neighborhood. Try to figure out how to be yourself in that place. He certainly was in jail. I'm sure he deserved it. He was in jail when T-Money started getting -- recruiting kids to be drug dealers in the neighborhood. When Correa and Ogarro were shot and killed, Melly was in jail. When Devin shot TA and White Mike, no one's suggesting that Melly was involved.

And if you look at those Facebook entries that the government put up there, it also has something above the Facebook entry which says, "Falsehoods. Deleted." I don't know what that means. But when they sit there and they glorify and — these Facebook entries being admissions of guilt, think

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

about that. Facebook is fantasy. It is a fantasy world that beats the real world to live. It doesn't prove drug dealing, it doesn't prove criminal activity.

And then there's Rob Young, the basketball coach. played basketball in a church group, Melly did, when he was younger, through 2007. It's true. The government will probably tell you in their rebuttal summation, he wasn't with them every day, he wasn't with them after 2007, actually. What he can tell you, though, and what he does -- he comes to this courtroom and he tells you from his perspective, Melly was a good kid, a good basketball player, and a captain of the team, along with two other kids, including his. I don't know if the government's going to try to spin that in a negative light, like somehow if you're the captain of the team, you're the captain of a gang. I don't know. Or I don't know if they're going to say, gee, when he points one finger up, he's really pointing a gun. Give him a break. His team won the championship. He was excited. Don't make everything in this kid's life ugly. Don't demonize him over everything.

Now I'm done. I wasn't two hours ago. Before I sit down, though, I want to just say one more thing. I can sit down now. All these guys, they get to argue. Ms. Heller, she gets to argue. And while all this is going on, I'm just sitting there saying, "Holy cow --" probably saying something else, but -- "Holy cow, I wish I could respond to that

argument, I wish I could -- I had another chance to talk to you." I have something to say about whatever argument they make. I don't get that chance. So I ask you that when you do deliberate in this case, when you sit there in the jury room and you say, well, Mr. Dinnerstein didn't say that and Mr. Dinnerstein didn't say that, one of you -- hopefully all of you, but at least somebody says, let's think about what Mr. Dinnerstein would have said. Be my surrogate. Be Melly's surrogate.

The government's case is based upon people that can't — that you wouldn't take anything — you wouldn't believe them if they told you that the sky was blue. You'd have to check it out yourself. You certainly wouldn't buy a used car from those guys. And here in federal court, the government sits there and they say, it's absolutely true what these guys say. Well, thank god they don't decide. Thank god in our system, you decide.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Members of the jury, we're going to take a short recess and then we will hear Mr. Lee's closing argument on behalf of Mr. Meregildo. Keep an open mind, don't discuss the case.

Please recess the jury.

THE CLERK: Come to order. Jury exiting.

(Jury excused)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(In open court; jury not present)

THE COURT: Are there any matters that counsel would like to raise?

All right. We'll take a -- yes, Mr. Lee?

MR. LEE: Your Honor, I'm going to provide the government and you that extra demonstrative.

THE COURT: Slide 46?

MR. LEE: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: The second revision?

MR. LEE: Yes. And --

THE COURT: Okay. Also, I don't know that it's going to come up again during your summation, but if the sun comes around into the podium and you just want to move the podium one way or the other, you go right ahead.

MR. LEE: Thank you very much, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. FEE: I'm sorry. Very small point. If possible, when counsel's going through, if they could — if they have the transcript cite ready when they're reading from something. We don't want to interrupt, of course, to ask for it, but if they have it and they can just point us to it, it would help the government.

THE COURT: I think in every instance except one, he gave the page number.

MR. FEE: It was several, but again, your Honor, we

25

laid out for other counsel.

MR. LEE:

```
1
      wouldn't interrupt, of course.
 2
               THE COURT: I recall one. All right.
 3
               MR. LEE: And in my slides, the transcript page is
 4
      noted, so the government can make notation as they see the
 5
      slide.
              I may not say the page.
6
                        That's fine.
               MR. FEE:
                                       Thank vou.
 7
               THE COURT: All right. The defendants can be escorted
      from the courtroom. We're going to take about a 20-minute
8
9
      recess.
10
               (Recess)
11
               (In open court; jury not present)
12
               THE COURT: All right. Any issues?
13
               MR. LEE: Your Honor, most respectfully, on the screen
14
      is the revised, and I believe the government has no objection
15
      and it's subject to your Honor's approval, of course.
16
               THE COURT: Any objection from the government?
17
               MS. HELLER: Not anymore, your Honor.
18
               THE COURT: Slide 46 as amended is suitable for you to
19
      show to the jury, Mr. Lee.
20
                        Thank you very much, your Honor.
               MR. LEE:
21
               THE COURT: All right. Let's bring in the jury.
22
               THE COURT: And once again, Mr. Lee, you'll have up to
23
      two hours for your closing and subject to the same rules I've
```

Thank you, your Honor.

(Jury present)

THE COURT: Members of the jury, at this time I ask that you give your undivided attention to Winston Lee, Esq., as he delivers his closing argument on behalf of the defendant Joshua Meregildo.

MR. LEE: Good afternoon, everyone.

THE JURORS: Good afternoon.

MR. LEE: I beg you, please listen carefully. It's that time in the afternoon when it may be difficult, but I think we can get through it. I think if you do what I'm sure you can do, which is work hard, carefully examine the evidence, I think you'll reach the right result. But it won't be easy, as I go through the evidence, because ladies and gentlemen, I'm not going to talk about and cast aspersions about people being liars or not, because I don't have to do that. The exhibits, the evidence will do that. I don't have to do that.

Now let's start and focus on the charges against Joshua Meregildo.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, when you begin to deliberate, if it hasn't, it's going to occur to you that the government's entire case against Joshua Meregildo is based upon three — three acts of criminal conduct by Mr. Meregildo. Only three.

And if we could see slide 1, those are the three charges upon which this case is based upon.

|           | 1.   | The   | very  | y, very | speci  | ific  | act · | that  | Mr. N | Meregildo | )  |
|-----------|------|-------|-------|---------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----------|----|
| participa | ted  | in t  | the s | shootir | ng and | kill  | ing   | of Ca | rrel  | Ogarro c  | n  |
| July 31,  | 2010 | ). [  | [hat' | 's one  | of the | e cha | rges  | upon  | whic  | ch the    |    |
| governmen | t ha | ıs ch | narge | ed Mr.  | Mereg  | ildo  | unde  | r var | ious  | theories  | of |
| criminal  | liab | oilit | гу.   |         |        |       |       |       |       |           |    |

2. The second charge is that he participated in the shooting of members of the 321 organization on September 13<sup>th</sup>, 2010, in the vicinity of 321 153<sup>rd</sup> Street, Bronx, New York. That's the second one.

And finally, that he was a member of a drug conspiracy.

In deliberating about Mr. Meregildo, those are the three acts you will have to decide whether the government has proved the case beyond a reasonable doubt.

Now as I said to you, I'm not here necessarily to call someone a liar. You can decide that for yourself. What I'm here is to show you and discuss with you what the evidence shows and what the lack of evidence is in this case.

So now first, if we could put up slide number 3.

This is an important slide. It relates to the murder of Carrel Ogarro. Now what I'm going to do, ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to describe to you what the one and only witness to Carrel Ogarro's murder testified to while he was using Government Exhibit 243 to describe what happened. And at the end, you're going to realize, based on the exhibits that

Cbq1mer7

Summation - Mr. Lee

I'll take you through, that in order to help himself, Devin
Parsons did not tell you the truth about what happened during
the crime, that moment, those moments when Carrel Ogarro was
shot and killed there.

Now let's just go through it. This is what he said.

And I'll read to you the actual testimony of Mr. Parsons as to what I'm summarizing now. What he says, during his testimony, he was given the pointer and he said right there, ladies and gentlemen, right there, a little bit to the left, that's where Joshua Meregildo and I, Devin Parsons, first had a brief few words with the victim, Carrel Ogarro, on that evening. That's what he said, and we'll see it in the transcript. You don't have to take my word for it.

And then you know what he said, ladies and gentlemen? After, after, after, after, after that conversation is finished, he turns around and he walks away. With his back, Mr. Ogarro walks away with his back to where Devin Parsons and Joshua Meregildo are standing. And then Devin Parsons testified that's when Joshua Meregildo fires the first shot into the back of the victim. Into the back. Devin Parsons never said, in any of his testimony — you can go through the thousands of pages — that Mr. Ogarro was never shot in the front left torso.

Not only that, he says -- and we'll see it -- he says that Mr. Meregildo had a .380-caliber handgun, and he shot

three shots and that Mr. Devin Parsons emptied his .22 revolver, six shots. That's nine shots, ladies and gentlemen.

And you know what he says happened? He says this.

It's very significant. He says, if you follow the pointer,
that Ogarro is going that way, to the right, to the right,
ladies and gentlemen, and he says toward Park Avenue. That's
very significant. We'll see when I show you diagrams. He says
Ogarro runs to the right toward Park Avenue.

Now -- and then you know what he said happens? He said this. He said Meregildo shoots, hits Ogarro in the back, Meregildo shoots a second shot, and then Parsons shoots his first shot. And then Meregildo shoots a third shot, but you know what Meregildo does, ladies and gentlemen? He runs. But you know which direction he runs in, ladies and gentlemen? He runs back in the opposite direction of where Ogarro's running, to the right, and he runs down this path. That's what Parsons told us. That's what Parsons told us.

And he also tells us that no shots were ever missed.

No one ever missed. He says he shot and emptied his six

bullets into Mr. Ogarro. And he never mentions that

Mr. Meregildo misses with his three shots. Okay?

Now -- and then he says Mr. Meregildo runs back toward Park Avenue. Not only that. He says Mr. Meregildo runs immediately, he shoots a third shot immediately, he doesn't stick around, he doesn't stick around to pick up shell casings,

Cbq1mer7

Summation - Mr. Lee

5983

he doesn't stick around doing anything. Immediately, after the 1 2 third shot, he runs back and that Mr. Parsons says that he ran 3 up and he killed Mr. Ogarro by standing over him. 4 Now that I've summarized it, I'm going to show you 5 from the transcripts, ladies and gentlemen. I'm going to show 6 you that he said that. And we can go to slide 2. 7 Ladies and gentlemen, this is what he said: 8 What gun was Killa using, Mr. Parsons? 9 A .380. 10 And what about you? 11 I had a 22. 12 And how many shots did Killa fire in? 13 You see I outline and in bold in three. 14 significant, ladies and gentlemen. Pay attention. Put on your 15 hats, ladies and gentlemen, because we're going to look at 16 these exhibits. The exhibits are going to expose Mr. Parsons' 17 lies, not me. Now he said: 18 19 Did you see all three shots fired? 20 I heard all three shots fired. 21 And how many shots did you fire? 22 Six. 23 Now where did you hit Mr. Carrel on his body? 24 I shot him twice in his head and like the rest was in 25 his body.

And what about Killa? Did you see where on his body he shot him?

I just seen him, like, the main shot was, like, in his lower back.

Back, ladies and gentlemen. Ogarro's back was always, always to them. And how do we know that? We'll look at the testimony that I'm going to show you now. But just look at the last sentence that's there, also. It's going to become significant:

And where was Walter, Walter Aponte, during all of this?

He was just holding the back door open.

Did Walter ever hold a gun, one of the guns?

No.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, now we're going to look at slide number 4. And we'll see, it begins — this is a clarification of the positioning of the people when the shooting occurs. And this is on direct examination by Ms. Nola Heller. And she refers Mr. Parsons to the Government Exhibit 243 that I just showed you the photo. Remember? And this is what he says. Look at the testimony:

If we can go back to 243.

That photo I just showed you, the place where the first encounter occurred, does this exhibit help you describe where everybody was when the shooting started?

25

We were on the side, a little bit over on the left 1 side. 2 3 Remember I showed you that, a little bit on the left 4 of the photo? And who is "we"? 5 6 Me and Killa. 7 So you were on the photograph, indicating the left side of the photograph. 8 9 Yes. 10 Where was Carrel Ogarro when the shooting started? 11 When the shooting started, he came -- he came from 12 this way and he stopped right here. 13 And where was he when that conversation happened, 14 those few words that were exchanged? 15 Ladies and gentlemen, look at that next line. I've outlined it, I've underlined it for you. 16 17 We already had the conversation. We already had our conversation. We finished. And when we -- when he, Mr. Carrel 18 Ogarro, walked away, walked away, he got right there and then, 19 20 after he walked away, then we started shooting him. 21 I don't know what transcript Mr. Fee has been reading, 22 but I'm showing you the transcript. 23 The previous transcript, if you want to make a

notation, it's page 2319. If you want testimony read back, you

can have it read back. You don't have to take my word for it.

Cbq1mer7

Summation - Mr. Lee

|                            | And there's other testimony. Page 2323. I even asked            |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|----------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|                            | you to write it down because you're going to have to, you know, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                            | want to take a look at this. But there's even more, ladies and  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                            | gentlemen. After he says, we already had the conversation and   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                            | when he walked away, he got right there and we started          |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                            | shooting.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                            | Now when you started shooting, if you look at the               |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                            | exhibit, where did you see Carrel go?                           |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                            | He tried to run. He tried to run back this way.                 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                            | See that? Towards Park Avenue. That's going to be               |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                            | significant, ladies and gentlemen. Towards Park Avenue, the     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                            | right side of the picture. That's what happened.                |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                            | But there's another transcript you need to look at,             |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| and that's slide number 5. |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                            | This is the testimony of Devin Parsons about what               |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                            | happened during those moments when Carrel Ogarro was shot. Not  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                            | by Meregildo, you'll find out soon.                             |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                            | What does he say? This is questioning. It says:                 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                            | Mr. Parsons, I want you to think back about the time            |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                            | that the shooting of Mr. Ogarro occurred, okay?                 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                            | Yes.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

He lies. You know what he says? He says -- and he's questioned:

And you stated that at some point in time you and Mr. Meregildo were beside Mr. Ogarro, correct?

Cbq1mer7 Summation - Mr. Lee

Yes.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2 Look at that, ladies and gentlemen.

You stated you're sure, you said that you saw Josh Meregildo fire that first shot, fire a .380 and hit Ogarro in the lower back?

Yes.

MR. FEE: Objection, your Honor. The first shot? I don't see that.

MR. LEE: Your Honor, ladies and gentlemen --

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. LEE: -- you'll see that it's the first shot that he meant, because Mr. Fee didn't let me finish. Okay? Because look, ladies and gentlemen. The next question:

You saw Mr. Meregildo fire a second shot before you fired your first shot?

As I summarized to you.

Correct.

Remember, Mr. Meregildo -- Mr. Parsons said he fired three shots. Here, look at the testimony:

You said you saw Mr. Meregildo fire a .380 and hit Ogarro in the lower back.

Yes.

You saw Meregildo fire a second shot before you fired your first shot, correct?

25 Yes.

Look at the next line, ladies and gentlemen: 1 Then, at some point, you say, Meregildo fired a third 2 3 shot? 4 I don't know what Mr. Fee's math is like, but that 5 sounds like three shots that Parsons is lying to us about. The first shot in the lower back, the second shot, and the third 6 7 shot. It says: Then at some point you say that Mr. Meregildo fires a 8 9 third shot and then starts running, right? 10 Yes. 11 Now it continues. 12 Mr. Ogarro, how far had he, meaning Carrel Ogarro, the 13 victim, been running down the path? 14 Well, he was probably the same distance you and I are. 15 And what I described for the record -- and you'll look at it on the screen -- the podium was here, and I said from the 16 podium near the end of the jury box down to the witness stand. 17 18 That's how far Mr. Ogarro ran. Mr. Meregildo ran that way, after his third shot. We've seen that in the testimony. 19 20 And it says, after he describes how far: 21 And he got that far? 22 Yes. 23 And then Devin Parsons says: 24 Then after that you say Meregildo, after firing that 25 third shot, ran away?

1

2 3

4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

Yes.

Well, Mr. Parsons, in that transcript, he was running with his back to you. Mr. Ogarro was running with his back to him.

> So he went down on his stomach, is that correct? Yes.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Fee has stressed that there was a .380 bullet that went into Mr. Ogarro's chest from the front. Big difference between what Mr. Parsons lied to us and what really occurred, and I'll show you, not because I say so, but from the evidence.

Now -- and one last thing as a notation to take me, but -- so Ogarro is always -- always has his back at the time of the shooting to Parsons and to Meregildo, according to Parsons.

Now as we said before, according to Ogarro, no one ever shot Mr. -- according to Mr. Parsons, nobody ever shot the victim in the front of the body at all. He never testified anywhere that he ever saw Meregildo or anyone shoot Mr. Ogarro, the victim, in the front of the body. You just saw he said in the back. Only in the back. And only as Ogarro was walking away or running away down the path towards Park Avenue.

Now -- and then just to stress, Meregildo after shooting runs in the opposite direction, perhaps he chases him for a third shot, but immediately after that third shot, he

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

runs in the opposite direction. And Mr. Ogarro runs down the path that way.

Now let's show slide number 6, ladies and gentlemen. This is extremely important. I'm going to refer to it continually during my statements to you. I ask you to stay with me and pay attention and it will all become clear. This is a chart created by Detective Rashida Jupiter. She's the crime scene unit detective who arrived on the scene. She did a diagram of what happened when she got on the scene. Now you can see on that diagram, when I just showed you that photograph, ladies and gentlemen, that Mr. Parsons used, that photo of the area where the conversation occurred, you can see that is at cone number 4. Do you see that? Do you know why, ladies and gentlemen? Do you know why cone number 4 is right where the conversation occurred? Because he said at that point Mr. Ogarro ran to the right of the photograph toward Park Avenue. What that photograph shows us, ladies and gentlemen, the photograph is going this way, in this direction, and you see Mr. Parsons says he started walking away. That's when, after he turned his back, we started shooting and he ran toward Park Avenue. That's cone 4. You see the various cones -- 3, 2, 1. Those were put there at the crime scene by Detective Jupiter when she arrived there. And you see from her key, you see from the key what each of those cones means, and soon I will show you the significance of those cones. But you can see

the placement of cone 4 and 3, ladies and gentlemen. Do you see cone 3 further down the path toward Park Avenue? Do you see that? That shows what's going to be on the next photograph.

If we could show slide 7.

Now you see it, ladies and gentlemen. Cone 4, cone 3, going down toward Park Avenue. That's the placement, and right there is where the conversation occurred and Ogarro runs down towards Park Avenue, in the direction of Park Avenue. And you notice, ladies and gentlemen, cone 3 is further down the path towards Park Avenue, which is the direction that Parsons says Ogarro ran towards.

Now let's go back to slide 6 again.

Now we know -- we know what this means. We know that slide -- cone 4 is there, 3 is there, and that's the direction that Ogarro ran as he was being shot.

And when you go back, look at the slides yourself. Your job is the hard job. All of you are going to go back there and look at these exhibits and examine them. I'm just here to help you, to the best of my ability, but certainly Ms. Stafford and I, and Josh Meregildo, we can't do what 12 intelligent, fair-minded people can do.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, the significance of this exhibit -- cone number 2. You see that? That, according to the key, ladies and gentlemen, that is where one, only one, not

Summation - Mr. Lee

three, the one, the .380 shell casing was recovered. It's found and recovered, down the path, in the direction that Ogarro ran, opposite the direction where Meregildo ran. That direction, Ogarro running, with his back, Meregildo always facing his back, but there's a shot to Ogarro's front chest from a .380-caliber, which is supposedly the gun that Meregildo was holding.

Now let's look at slide number 8.

There's cone number 2. That's where the one .380 shell casing is recovered, and if you notice, and we go back onto slide number 6 again, we see cone 2, down the way. That's where, ladies and gentlemen, the one shot from a .380 was fired, into the front of Ogarro, by someone. Can't tell you who it was. According to Parsons, Meregildo is behind Ogarro here. Ogarro is running and Meregildo shoots. But we have one shot to the front of Ogarro, down there by cone number 2.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, now we've established that a .380 shell casing, only one, was recovered by cone 2, far away from where Meregildo supposedly was when he had that conversation with Ogarro and when Ogarro turned his back and started walking or running away, and Parsons says Meregildo shot him in the back, with the .380.

Well, let's look now, ladies -- I told you that the crime scene unit, the ballistics and the autopsy reports are going to show and expose Mr. Parsons' lies, okay? The autopsy

Cbq1mer7 Summation - Mr. Lee report will show that one gunshot wound, gunshot A, a 1 .380-caliber bullet, went into the front of Ogarro's body on 2 3 the left torso. But Mr. Parsons says the only thing that ever 4 happened was shots were fired at Ogarro's back. 5 MR. FEE: Objection. Not in evidence. 6 THE COURT: Overruled. 7 MR. LEE: Now, ladies and gentlemen, let's look at slide 9. 8 9 This slide is a diagram, Government Exhibit 200A. And 10 you can see on that diagram circled in red is the wound I'm 11 talking about. That's a wound, wound A. And let's look at the 12 testimony of Dr. Ely while she's explaining that diagram, 13 ladies and gentlemen. And that's at slide 9-1. 14 First, the court states: 15 While the doctor is drawing, the record should reflect that Government Exhibit 200A is being published to the jury and 16 17 everyone in the courtroom. And I assume, Doctor, that when you 18 refer to gunshot wound A, the A that you're drawing is going to

correspond to the A on Government Exhibit 200A?

Yes.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now could we just see slide 9 again for a moment. And that's the wound she's talking about, wound A to the front chest.

Now let's go back to slide 9.1 again.

Now you see what I highlighted. The question is --

Cbq1mer7

Summation - Mr. Lee

5994

now her answer is this: 1 2 Bullet A enters Mr. Ogarro's body on his left chest. 3 And then she describes how it travels. But 4 continuing, the question is asked: 5 What could you notice, if anything, about the 6 direction that the bullet entered the body? 7 Front side of his body to the back side. Front to back, ladies and gentlemen. Not back to 8 9 front. 10 How does Mr. Meregildo -- if we go back to slide 6 11 just for a moment, slide 6, how does Meregildo get down there 12 to that one shell casing where the shell casing is found, and 13 fire a shot into the front of Ogarro's body, that he starts 14 here, fires all three shots, according to Parsons, while Ogarro's back is to him --15 MR. FEE: Objection, not in evidence. 16 17 THE COURT: Overruled. 18 MR. LEE: How does that happen? Did he fly there on 19 wings? It's impossible. 20 Ladies and gentlemen, let's continue just looking at 21 the transcript. 22 Now was any bullet recovered from Mr. Ogarro from 23 wound A? 24 Yes. 25 And can you describe that bullet?

The bullet that was removed from his body was a gray metal bullet.

She describes it.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, let's look further at the autopsy report.

Now at slide number 10, this is her report. And you can see, down in the bottom, in connection with wound A, the direction this bullet traveled is front to back. Do you recall the testimony I just showed you, ladies and gentlemen? The testimony of Mr. Parsons who said, we were with Carrel Ogarro after the conversation started, he turned, he walked away, and that's when Mr. Meregildo shot him in the back. And Mr. Meregildo shot again, and then I shot my shot, and eventually, Mr. Ogarro went down.

How does the one .380 go into the front chest of Mr. Ogarro? But how do we know it's the .380 that went into the front chest, ladies and gentlemen? We're going to see it in the evidence. We're going to see it.

Now first, I should stress, that autopsy report establishes -- and you can read it yourself, Government Exhibit 200 -- seven shots to Mr. Ogarro's body. Not -- that's six from Mr. Parsons, six shots, and the one from somebody down by cone A who shot Mr. Ogarro in the foot. Mr. Parsons told us that Meregildo shot three shots and he shot six. That's nine. That's not seven. He doesn't miss and Mr. Meregildo, according

Cbq1mer7

Summation - Mr. Lee

to him, doesn't miss. The numbers don't add up. 1 2 MR. FEE: Objection. Not in evidence as well. 3 THE COURT: Overruled. 4 MR. LEE: Now, ladies and gentlemen, what happened to 5 the bullets that were removed from Ogarro's body? Let's see slide number 11. 6 7 This is a photo, ladies and gentlemen, Government Exhibit 220 -- 255A -- 225A. Excuse me. These are the 8 9 ballistics evidence recovered from Mr. Ogarro's body. Envelope 10 number 1, that's the envelope, the .380-caliber bullet that was 11 removed from Mr. Ogarro's front left torso. 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 12 those are fragments recovered from other parts of Mr. Ogarro's 13 body. 14 (Continued on next page) 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

|       | MR.    | LEE:    | How do | we kr  | now this | ? Let's | look | at | slide |
|-------|--------|---------|--------|--------|----------|---------|------|----|-------|
| 11.1. | What I | Dr. Ely | testi  | fied o | on direc | t.      |      |    |       |

- "Q. Doctor, what happened to the ballistics evidence. The bullets the fragments that you recovered from Mr. Ogarro's body?
- "A. I removed all of the ballistics evidence and I individually placed those pieces of ballistics into envelopes that were labeled as to the particular wound in his body."

She took the envelopes and she labeled as she removed the bullets where the .380 came from. She wrote down torso. She wrote down on each envelope which part of the body those fragments came from.

Ladies and gentlemen, how do we know that the .380, this bullet that was removed from gunshot wound A, entered the front of Ogarro's body, how do we know it is a .380 caliber bullet? First of all, we know that only one shell casing was recovered at the scene.

If we looked at slide 14, we see again, this shows envelope number one, the envelope containing .380. Ladies and gentlemen, it's right here. You can look at it. And Officer Jonathan Fox testified to it. That .380 bullet which he identified as an expert was recovered from the torso. The front torso of Mr. Ogarro. Again, he identified that wound A, in the front chest of Mr. Ogarro, was a .380 caliber. Removed from the front chest, ladies and gentlemen. Mr. Ogarro was

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summation - Mr. Lee

5998

shot in the front but only one shot from a .380 caliber qun, and it was down the path by cone number two. Far away from where Meregildo is alleged to have ever been. Completely contrary to what Parsons has told you.

Now, we also know from Detective Fox that the other bullets that were in Ogarro's body came from a different gun, a second gun. They didn't come from a .380. How do we know that? We can look at slide 16. This is Jonathan Fox testifying. He says: Now, am I correct that based on your analysis of item of the four bullet fragments item 1, 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, those four envelopes we just saw, were you able to conclude sufficiently that the .380 caliber bullet in item number one was fired from a different firearm than the fragments contained in 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3? That's correct. This shows that these gunshot wounds did not come from the .380. But from a different gun. The .22 that Devin Parsons was firing that night.

Now, how do we know that? And we just looked at 16.1. If we want to examine that evidence, the envelopes will say it right on there, envelope one, with a .380 caliber bullet was from the torso, the other bullets were from the forearm, wrist and head.

Ladies and gentlemen, how do we know, I keep on saying there was only one shot fired from a .380 caliber that evening. Not three. How do I know that? I tell you how we know that,

CBQ3MER8

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summation - Mr. Lee

ladies and gentlemen. Because Detective Jonathan Fox testified that every time -- this is the gun allegedly used. Every time a semi-automatic qun is fired, it ejects a shell casing. Do you remember he testified to that? And I'll show you. He said every time out of this hole here, you shoot a shot, a shell comes out, and that's the way a semi-automatic qun works. Not the .22 revolver that Devin Parsons used. That retains the shell casings inside the cylinder that you see loaded in the pistols. But in a semi-automatic, every time you shoot, a shell casing comes out.

We don't have three shell casings at the scene of the murder, ladies and gentlemen. We only have one. And as we showed on Government Exhibit 6, it's all the way down in slide number six. It is all the way down by cone number two, the one shell casing.

We can look at slide number 17.

I correct -- this is the questioning of Detective Fox the ballistics expert. Am I correct that every time a semi-automatic handgun such as the one shown in Government Exhibit 275, every time that gun is fired a shell casing is ejected? Correct? That's the way it works. Yes.

You can examine the one shell casing yourself and you know what you will see on the envelope, ladies and gentlemen? It will say that it was recovered at the ramp down by cone two.

But, ladies and gentlemen, how do we know, how are we

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

certain there was only one shell casing at the scene? Because, the police arrived immediately. I'll show you the testimony. Within 60 seconds they arrive on the scene, there is no time for anybody to pick up shell casings, to remove shell casings, to change the crime scene at all. You have testimony that the police arrived immediately, the crime scene was secured, and nothing was moved or removed or rearranged in any manner. There is absolutely no time for anyone to alter that crime scene, and that crime scene speaks the truth and it reveals Mr. Parsons' untruth and lie.

Let's look at slide 19. You'll recall Officer Guzman. She's the first responder to the scene. She said that she was at her police station P.S.A. 7 and she heard shots fired. immediately went there. How long did it take you to arrive there after you heard those shots at the scene of the Ogarro murder? 60 seconds.

According to Parsons, Meregildo runs immediately back, he runs up, when I asked him questions. Not that he walked up. He ran up to Mr. Ogarro and finished him off with the full six shots, the remaining five shots from this gun and he ran.

We know that Sergeant Persaud and Officer Guzman told us when they went there, they saw no one, they secured the area, and then we know from Detective Jupiter, the person who did that diagram, she assures us that that crime scene was secured and no one touched anything and was never altered and

only one shell casing was recovered.

This is her being questioned: When you arrived there, was the crime scene secured? I know there was at least one, meaning law enforcement detectives, that was safeguarding the location. It was an open large area. I couldn't tell you how many officers were there. Safeguarding. It was safeguarded and you recovered only one shell casing? Correct. Do you know whether or not that shell casing was touched or moved in any manner by any law enforcement personnel? When I got there, no one touched it.

Can we see slide six again. Right there. You saw the picture of it, that's where the shell was found. Nobody touched it. And how do we know that where that shell is located, how do we know that establishes where the person who shot Carrel Ogarro, where he was located when he shot that one .380 caliber shot into Ogarro's chest? We know it based on testimony from law enforcement experts. We know that they say that the shells are recovered where the shooter was located.

Let's look at slide number 21. This is the testimony of an Evidence Collection Team member. His name is Officer Ingoglio. He is a responder to another scene. This is what he says in describing how the location of the shell, when you find it, indicates where the person was when he shot the shot. This is what he said. Officer, would you please hand me the shell casings and the voucher as well. Thank you. Officer Ingoglio,

based on your experience as an Evidence Collection Team member, what did it mean that shell casings were found at that location? Well, somebody had fired a firearm from that location. And typically, do you find shell casings near where the shooter is located or near where the bullets landed? From where the shooter was shooting. We know from Detective Jonathan Fox, he said that when you shoot a .380, the shell casing goes to the side.

Ladies and gentlemen, what does all this show? It shows that first, we saw the testimony of Parsons. I showed it to you, Ogarro and Meregildo, according to him, and Meregildo is not even there. The conversation had ended. And Ogarro had already turned around and started walking away toward Park Avenue and that's when they started shooting. I showed you that. Parsons never says that Ogarro was shot in the front. But we see from the autopsy from the ballistics there is a .380 recovered from his front left chest. He never says anyone is shot in the front by anybody. And all the shots he describes are in the back of Ogarro. And now we know based on everything that I've shown you there is only one shot fired from a .380 gun, because only one .380 shell casing was recovered. And that .380 shell casing was found down by cone two, down by cone two. Down, far down the path towards Park Avenue.

The location where the .380 shell casing was recovered establishes where the shooter was when he shot Ogarro in the

front with his gun. We know based on the number of shots there was only one shot.

Ladies and gentlemen, there is no fingerprints on this gun, no matter how much they tried or even DNA establishing who held that gun. That evidence would be irrefutable. I wouldn't be here standing here talking to you. What we have is Parsons telling you a story that's refuted by the exhibits and by the evidence.

Ladies and gentlemen, Parsons' testimony about William Aponte is troubling. He says that William Aponte was just holding the door and was at the scene. One thing we do know based on Parsons' testimony, Aponte was there. He was there, and somebody — show slide six. Somebody intercepted Ogarro down by cone two and shot him in the front with the .380.

According to Parsons, it is impossible that Meregildo did that.

I don't know if you can ingest everything I've said, but I hope that as conscientious, fair-minded jurors you'll consider what I said, you'll go back there and you'll examine the evidence and look at it the way I've looked at it. Because that's your job. That's your job. And as Mr. Dinnerstein said, the hard part starts now. Because I'm just trying my best to assist you. But you're going to have to look at the evidence and say does it actually refute what Mr. Parsons has told us.

And he says Aponte was just there holding the door,

about.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

6004

but you know what we know about Mr. Aponte, we know that he is a cooperator. And we know that for Mr. Parsons to testified against him, cooperator, is impossible. Cooperators plead guilty and the government doesn't need Parsons to testify against a cooperator. He needs to testify against somebody at trial. Somebody that he can help and provide information

Ladies and gentlemen, there is another lie, a significant lie that Mr. Parsons told. He told a lie about what happened before and during the murder. And how do we know that? Just look at the testimony. It will establish this, ladies and gentlemen, Walter Aponte and Devin Parsons were together all that evening. Before, during, and after the Ogarro murder. We'll see later on that Mr. Parsons earlier said things about Aponte that is totally different and contradicting, contradictory to his testimony here that all Aponte did was hold the door. That's all Aponte did, according to his trial testimony here. He says he never held a gun in his hand and he just held the door. And we'll find that's not the case and you can't forget the fact that now his testimony here is saying Meregildo was involved, and Aponte did nothing. And Aponte is the cooperator. Aponte is the one that if he were to give testimony to it wouldn't help him, would it? government doesn't need him for that. He's got to have something to trade. He's got to testify against somebody who

is here, claiming he did it.

Let's just talk about Parsons. He lied to us, ladies and gentlemen. I'll show you the transcripts. It's not me. The transcripts expose Mr. Parsons' lie. You know what he said? It's been a while but you have to remember what he said was he had earlier been in the basketball court, hanging around, and he says that he went home with Brittany Brown. And he was home, and Meregildo called him, Meregildo calls him and says come murder somebody with me. He called him while he was back at his apartment with Brittany Brown. We'll see, we'll see Devin Parsons' lie on slide number .22. How did it begin, Mr. Parsons? I was in my house with a girl named Bree. And Killa called me and to come to Jacksons.

That's what he says. But you know what? That's not what happened, ladies and gentlemen. If you follow me. What happened was Devin Parsons and Walter Aponte stayed outside, outside, and they went, they got guns and they committed the murder. And the lie is shown in Brittany Brown's testimony. Brittany contradicts Parsons and testifies that Devin Parsons did not go back to his apartment, and that Aponte and Devins stayed at the basketball court and were together before and during the murder.

Let's look at slide number 23. This is Brittany Brown testifying contrary to Mr. Parsons saying he went home, he was in his apartment, having nothing to do with the planning or

CBQ3MER8

Summation - Mr. Lee

anything to do with the murder of Ogarro, and Killa called him. This is what she says. What were you doing that evening? This is Brittany Brown testifying. I was outside in Courtlandt in the park. Can you name some of the people you were with? I was with Walter Aponte and Devin Parsons. Not Meregildo there. And then what happens? Well, did there come a time when you left the park? Yes. What time was that? It was about 2 o'clock in the morning. And where did you go when you left? I went to Devin's house. Did you go to Devin's house alone or with anybody? I went alone. Who did you leave in the park? Everybody. I left Devin and Walt down there at the park.

What happens is that Parsons wakes her up by calling her the morning after Ogarro was murdered. Brittany Brown contradicts Parsons and says that Parsons called her. This is what happens. Brittany Brown says she went back without Parsons, Parsons stayed at the basketball court and stayed out with Aponte and did the murder. What did she say? She said what woke you up, if anything? This is slide 24. My phone was ringing constantly. And who was calling you on your phone? Devin.

In other words, ladies and gentlemen, Devin Parsons never went back with her. He stayed out with Aponte, and he lied to you when he said he went back to the apartment and Killa called him to come out. She says she left them in the park and he wakes her in the morning.

And what time does he wake her? If you look at slide 25, it could be anywhere seven to eight in the morning. She's asked this. So you left Devin Parsons and you go back to where he had been living and you go to sleep, correct? Yes. Now you don't have an exact recollection back on now the morning when you woke up, right? You know it was morning time, right? Yes. And you think could it have been somewhere between seven and eight in the morning? It was very early. When you say very early, that includes you think seven and eight in the morning, right? Yes.

Ladies and gentlemen, he's saying he went home with Brittany Brown, had nothing to do with anything, and then Killa calls him. She contradicts him and says I left them out there. Walter Aponte and Devin Parsons together and I didn't hear from them until the morning time when he woke me up with a phone call.

What is Devin Parsons hiding from us? What is he trying to hide as far as not only his involvement, but Walter Aponte's involvement?

Ladies and gentlemen, there is even a more significant lie. If you can follow me, I know it's late. But, the most — one of the most significant lies is the circumstances of Devin Parsons and Aponte obtaining the guns to do the murder of Ogarro. What Parsons told us was that he, if you look at the testimony, Parsons says that Devin Parsons went to Pemberton's

apartment with Meregildo and Aponte, and got one gun. One gun. He says that Meregildo had a .380 and we needed another gun so all three of us, Aponte, Meregildo, and Parsons went to Pemberton's apartment to get an additional gun.

We know that that's not true. What happened was, and you'll see it in the transcript in a moment, what happened is that Aponte went into Pemberton's apartment, came back with two guns. Two guns. One for him and one for Devin Parsons. There was only two guns at the scene. If Meregildo has a gun, and if Devin Parsons wants another, second gun there, is no need for two guns if Aponte is not going to hold a gun. If Aponte gets two guns, there's three guns. There was no need to ask for two, except if what the truth is Meregildo wasn't there, and they were just asking — Aponte was asking for two guns for him and Parsons.

Let's look at the testimony. And that's at slide 27. This is Pemberton testifying, ladies and gentlemen. And he os testifying about what happened the evening before Ogarro was murdered. Do you recall the day that Carrel was killed? Yeah. What happened after you fell asleep? Somebody woke me up. Do you remember who you woke up — who woke you up, Mr. Pemberton? Walter Aponte. Not Devin Parson, not Joshua Meregildo. Walter Aponte goes into his bedroom and what does he do, according to Mr. Pemberton? Well, what happens after Walt woke you up? He told me to give him a gun. What did you do? I gave him it.

Well, Mr. Pemberton, what, if anything, did you do, what did
Walt say about why he wanted the gun? He didn't. Okay. So
what happened after you gave a gun to Walt? I tried to go back
to sleep. Did you go back to sleep? I tried but he woke me
back up. What happened when he woke you up a second time? He
asked me for another gun. A second gun.

Devin Parsons says he went and got one gun and Pemberton says Aponte came into my bedroom and he asked for two. And did you give him a gun? Yeah.

Parsons is shown to be a liar. Not because I'm just asserting that he's a liar. The testimony shows that what happened is that Aponte went in there to get two guns for him and Parsons, Meregildo wasn't ever seen in this apartment. Pemberton says that evening, he never says he saw Meregildo there. No one has testified that Meregildo was in Pemberton's apartment to retrieve a gun to go murder Carrel Ogarro.

Even more so, ladies and gentlemen, look to slide 28. We see as just more conclusive proof that Pemberton asks Aponte for the two guns back. We see it at slide 28. Mr. Pemberton, after Walt took those guns from under your bed and you gave them those guns from under your bed, were the guns returned to you that same day? No. At any point did you need to get the guns back? I asked for them. You asked who? Walter Aponte, ladies and gentlemen. That's page 1442. You can see it at the bottom. You want to make a notation, make the notation. And

CBQ3MER8

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summation - Mr. Lee

later on if you want transcripts read back to you, it will be very easy. You can see that, you can just ask and you can see for yourself and you can look at it carefully.

Ladies and gentlemen, Devin Parsons and Aponte were together before, during, and after the murder. They were there before, contrary to Devin Parsons' assertion that he went back home with Brittany. She says I went home alone and he called me about 8 o'clock, 7 o'clock in the morning after the murder. And we know that they were together before the murder, because Pemberton says that Aponte came into the room, and got two guns.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'll just quickly, just if you'll look carefully, the inconsistencies and contradictions of Mr. Parsons, his deceit is so apparent in the record. Do you remember Mr. Parsons saying that he called Brittany to come to the house and he gave her the guns so that she could take them out of the apartment and take them away? He called her. But and he says that he put the guns in her purse. A female purse. Let's look at that. That's slide 30.

What happened when she arrived? Mr. Parsons answers, I was still cleaning off the guns. And I put the guns in her bag. And we, me and her walked out the building.

Ladies and gentlemen, he even testifies further, he elaborates his lie and he describes it as a purse at slide 31. He says, Mr. Parsons, I want you to think about being inside

the apartment of Walter Aponte after the shooting of Ogarro.

Did you testify yesterday that you placed a gun or guns inside
the purse of Bree? Yes. Was it a female purse or was it a
man's purse?

Ladies and gentlemen, Brittany Brown completely contradicts Devin Parsons. We can see that at slide 32. She testifies she came over, and she said what happened. She was asked what happened with the first thing that happened when you got inside the room. I asked Devin what happened. And he was just like adamant, he was adamant. Then what happened. He asked me to carry a sneaker box.

Where is the female purse? Ladies and gentlemen, there is a big difference between a sneaker box, him asking Brittany Brown to take guns out in a sneaker box and the female purse. Is there any way to mistake a sneaker box inside a shopping bag and a female purse? Why is Devin Parsons lying to us?

Well, we know that he's here trying to help himself. He's trying to avoid a life sentence and he's trying to help provide assistance to the government.

Devin Parsons while he was in that room, he never revealed what was in the sneaker box and he never revealed what happened with Ogarro prior to being in that room. A sneaker box was never opened, ladies and gentlemen. We'll see that in slide 33 when Brittany Brown testifies. When she goes into

Summation - Mr. Lee

that room, she answers the questions and you see it in bolded. While you were all there, the box was never -- and she answers. No, the box was never opened, ever. And while you were all there in that room, when you asked Mr. Parsons about what was in that bag, he refused to answer you, correct? Correct.

No one in that apartment at that time, other than Aponte, and other than Parsons, knew about what happened to Ogarro and knew what was in that sneaker box. It was never opened. Nothing was ever discussed. Brittany Brown was in that apartment she testified, I don't know, five minutes?

Devin Parsons says they were in there one minute. She comes in and she leaves. Who she saw, if she saw, who would know anything about what had happened when Parsons, who we already know is a proven liar, and Aponte trying to hide something. No one would know what happened. You could have walked into that apartment for any reason and been there and not have known about the Ogarro murder occurring previously that late evening. You would not have even know known that murder weapons were in a sneaker box. It was never spoken about, it was never opened.

Ladies and gentlemen, finally, we do have a glimmer, we learn the reasons why Parsons is lying and we learn that Ogarro was killed by Parsons and Aponte because of a personal problem. Personal problem between Ogarro and Aponte, and not, not because Parsons and Meregildo were offered money by T-Money. No. It was a personal dispute between Aponte and

Summation - Mr. Lee

Ogarro and we learn it from Devin Parsons' mouth himself. How do we know it? He says it. Let's look at slide 34. She's back with Dev Parsons and she has another conversation with Dev Parsons. And what she says was, do you see underlined that there had been some sort of a problem between Aponte and someone else. Is that true? Yes. Did you understand that someone else who had been killed to be the person who had been shot? Yes.

Devin Parsons says to Brittany Brown that there had been some sort of a problem between Aponte and someone else.

Do you understand that someone else to be the person who had been shot? Yes.

He admits it again at slide number 36. Brittany Brown is testifying about what Devin Parsons told her. He did say clearly that there was a personal problem between Mr. Aponte and this person who got shot, right? Yes. And did he say that Mr. Aponte, Walter Aponte at some point in time after having this personal problem with the person who was shot, he had a gun in his hand, right? Yes.

What we have is Brittany Brown relating to us what
Devin Parsons told her. Completely contrary to what he
testified here at trial. Walter Aponte just held the door and
he never held a gun in his hand that evening in connection with
the murder of Ogarro. And there Brittany Brown tells you he
told her Aponte had the gun in his hand.

Summation - Mr. Lee

But there's more. Let's look at slide 36. Now she's asked again about her conversation with Devin Parsons. At page 2738. You can see every page underneath noted if you want to make a notation. So, you understood that based upon what you heard from Mr. Parsons that Walter Aponte had the gun in his hand and intended to shoot the person who died that day, right? Yes. Yes.

He told her that Aponte had a gun in his hand and was intending to shoot Ogarro. What did he tell you here? Aponte holds a door open? He never has a gun in his hand? Devin Parson's statements to Brittany totally contradicts his trial testimony, and we know it now that he's not only lied about what Joshua Meregildo did, but he concealed what Walter Aponte did the night of the murder.

Now, when we hear also just briefly that there is problems between Aponte and Ogarro from other people. Even Pemberton at slide 37. Mr. Aponte said to you, Mr. Pemberton, Mr. Aponte said that he was scared of people in his building, right? Correct? Correct. And his building, the address is 300, correct, it's 300? Correct. And Mr. Ogarro, the person who was killed, he lives at 300, doesn't he? Correct.

And Devin Parsons himself admits at a time early on, after the murder, before it becomes in his interest to say something different and change his story, he admits that there was a personal problem between Ogarro and Aponte. We look at

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summation - Mr. Lee

slide 38. This is Devin Parsons' own words. You told Capo that you killed Ogarro for Aponte, right? Yes, I probably did This is him admitting, Devin Parsons admitting before he's arrested by the federal authorities and has a reason to lie, to have a reason to change his story from Aponte and Ogarro having a problem and Ogarro being killed because of that problem, he changes his story and says now, T-Money paid me and Meregildo to kill Ogarro. This is his statement about what he said before he met these people. These people who have his life in his hands and want him to provide information.

Before he met them, Ogarro was killed for personal reasons, a personal problem between Aponte and Ogarro. After he meets these people, no, that wasn't the truth. I was telling a story. Telling people whatever they want. T-Money paid me.

That's the change and we'll find out why it is a significant change that he now will give the government what they need to obtain a conviction against Mr. Meregildo. If he tells them it was for a personal reason, Mr. Meregildo is not quilty. These personal reasons, if you commit a murder for a personal reason, it is not something that's an element of the charges against Mr. Meregildo. It has to be for money or the gain or to maintain a position in the enterprise. If he can't give them that, it totally will not help them.

Let's look at slide 39. He again states in his own

Summation - Mr. Lee

words before he had a reason to lie. Before. Is it a fact before you were arrested by the federal authorities, you were telling people, including Capo, that Ogarro was killed because of personal problems between Mr. Ogarro and Aponte, that's a fact, right? I did say that. For personal reasons, right? Yes.

Killing Ogarro for a personal reason will not make

Joshua Meregildo guilty of murder in aid of racketeering. It

won't make him guilty of the RICO charge because it's not done
in connection with any drug business, any criminal enterprise.

It's done for a personal reason. And that's why he changes his
story after he meets his lawyers, after he decides to
cooperate. And now he has something valuable to give them. It
was done for money. And that will make Joshua Meregildo
guilty. If it's personal reasons, Joshua Meregildo is not
guilty.

And you know, as I said, Parsons has to give up

Meregildo because Aponte is already cooperating. And

testifying against Aponte is just not going to help. And

Parsons only denies what he clearly stated that it was for

personal reasons only after he's arrested by the federal

authorities, and only after he needs to give information to

help, to help them make the case against Meregildo. That's why

Parsons' story changes from Aponte holding the gun and

intending to shoot, as he told Brittany, to later on, just

holding the door and saying Meregildo did the shooting.

How do we know Aponte's cooperating? Because Agent Castillo told us. If we look at slide number 40. Castillo is answering the question. And also Aponte, when did he begin to cooperate? He began cooperating around November 2010.

Ladies and gentlemen, we'll never know what the actual personal problem was between Aponte and between Ogarro. We're certainly never going to know what happened the night Ogarro was murdered. Why? There is only one witness here, ladies and gentlemen. Did you notice that? Devin Parsons. And we know Devin Parsons can't be trusted or relied upon. And frankly, we'll never know because a cooperating witness, Mr. Walter Aponte, was never here. The cooperating witness never appeared and testified.

We do know that Ogarro was killed for a personal reason and not in connection with the affairs or activities of this so-called enterprise that the government gave a name to.

Ladies and gentlemen, if that murder of Ogarro as

Parsons himself at his own mouth said committed for personal
reasons, it is not a racketeering activity. It is not guilty.

Because you have to commit the murder in connection with the
affairs of the racketeering enterprise, and you'll understand
that clearly when Judge Pauley explains to you the law. If
it's done, it has to be done to further your position, to
increase your position from money from the enterprise, not for

a personal reason that has nothing to do with the enterprise.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, another element that the government must prove against Joshua Meregildo is that he committed a murder for payment of money. That would make Joshua Meregildo guilty --

MR. FEE: Objection. Misstatement of the law.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. LEE: Ladies and gentlemen, Parsons needs to say he was paid by T-Money in order to provide useful, substantial assistance to the government and to help prove their case and establish an element of the charge against Mr. Meregildo. But that lie is further exposed. Ladies and gentlemen, T-Money never offered to pay money to anyone to commit acts of violence. Payment of money is a necessary element and that's why Parsons --

MR. FEE: Objection. Misstatement of law.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. LEE: Let's just look at the testimony, look at the evidence that shows that that never occurred.

Now, it's only after Devin Parsons is arrested, speaks to his attorney, decides to provide information and to cooperate, all of a sudden, the story changes again.

(Continued on next page)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Summation - Mr. Lee

MR. LEE: Now it's that he's being paid by T-Money to commit the murder. But no one, no one except Parsons says that T-Money ever offered money. Dev Parsons is the only one, after he's arrested and decides to cooperate, and tried to help the government, who says that.

Let's just look at -- out of his own words. Let's look at slide 42.

Now Devin Parsons himself admits, admits, at page 2919, that he never told anyone until after he was arrested on federal charges, that he was offered money. The question:

Am I correct that before you were arrested by the federal authorities, you did not tell anyone that T-Money had offered to pay you or paid you money to kill Ogarro, is that correct?

I didn't tell anybody.

Isn't it a fact that the first time that you told anybody that T-Money offered you money and paid you money to kill Ogarro was to the federal prosecutors after, after you had been arrested on federal charges?

And ladies and gentlemen, there's no coincidence that not one cooperator, upon being asked the questions, ever heard anything about or said T-Money would pay any money to anybody to commit acts of violence.

Let's look at slide 43.

| 1  | This is Bernard Folks. He admits to doing shootings,           |
|----|--|
| 2  | and he says he was never offered money by T-Money for anybody. |
| 3  | Mr. Folks is asked this question:                              |
| 4  | Did T-Money ever pay you to go shoot somebody, the             |
| 5  | Maria Lopez crew? Did he ever do that?                         |
| 6  | And this is what he said, very clearly:                        |
| 7  | No. I ain't even heard about him paying anybody to go          |
| 8  | do anything.   |
| 9  | But Devin Parsons all of a sudden is the only one who          |
| 10 | gets paid by T-Money, providing the necessary element to find  |
| 11 | Mr. Meregildo guilty.  |
| 12 | MR. FEE: Objection. Misstatement of law.                       |
| 13 | MR. LEE: Now it's no   |
| 14 | THE COURT: Hold on. Hold on.                                   |
| 15 | Overruled.   |
| 16 | MR. LEE: We hear from Aubrey Pemberton, who did so             |
| 17 | many shootings, he was never paid anything.                    |
| 18 | Look at slide 44.  |
| 19 | Did T-Money so when you're shooting at these people            |
| 20 | that you've described, did T-Money ever pay you to shoot at    |
| 21 | anybody? Pay you money?  |
| 22 | No.  |
| 23 | Did he ever even offer you money to shoot at people?           |
| 24 | No.  |
| 25 | The only one getting paid is Devin Parsons, the person         |

25

Correa.

Summation - Mr. Lee who came here trying to help himself. The only one in this 1 tightly knit organization. These people who are together, have 2 3 understandings and agreements and protocols, no one else is getting paid except him. How can we explain that? 4 5 In fact, Meregildo was never paid by him, even 6 according to Devin Parsons. Devin Parsons was asked, at slide 7 45: 8 Did T-Money ever pay you what he promised he would pay 9 you for the murder? 10 He gave me about 3,000, a little over 3,000. 11 Do you know whether he paid Killa? 12 No. 13 Why would he pay -- why would T-Money pay Parsons and 14 not Meregildo? I thought they were both offered to commit this 15 murder of Ogarro? Parsons' explanation as to why he did not tell anybody 16 that T-Money had paid him is ridiculous. Do you remember he 17 said: 18 I guess -- it wasn't the truth. I was just telling 19 20 people whatever I wanted to because T-Money would not want me 21 to tell people that he offered me money. 'Cause T-Money didn't 22 want to make it known. 23 If you recall the testimony, T-Money was openly --

He wasn't afraid of letting anybody know that he

T-Money was openly admitting to people that he killed Jason

Cbq1mer9

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

killed Jason Correa. He was telling people. Status, it maintained his stature, it makes people respect him and fear him. And you heard testimony from so many people that T-Money put out orders, publicly, you see any rival gang members, you come and you shoot them. He's issuing orders in public to shoot to kill rival gang members. But all of a sudden, when it comes to Devin Parsons, as to why it's not true that it was a personal reason is because T-Money wouldn't want me to tell people. Does that ring true?

And then you have Mr. Fee telling you that Carrel Ogarro is a threat to T-Money's organization and that's why he was killed. That's absurd. Ogarro -- first of all, I don't mean anything by it, but he was addicted to angel dust. He was a dust head, ladies and gentlemen. You hear he's sitting around with his head bowed down, acting weird, walking around, but he never sold or had anything to do, according to the government, with T-Money's organization. He wasn't part of it. He wasn't selling for it. He knew nothing about it. He was not in a position to provide any information whatsoever about an organization he had nothing to do with. How can he provide information about something he was not a part of? He doesn't know the inner workings of it. He was absolutely no threat. And if you remember carefully, about Chris Ogarro, the brother of Mr. Ogarro, his testimony about Carrel Ogarro, he said this. You know, Carrel Ogarro had moved away from the neighborhood.

sense?

He only came back to the neighborhood two days before he was killed. What kind of a threat — he wasn't even in the neighborhood. He came into the neighborhood two days, and he was killed. But according to the government, that's why he was killed, because he was viewed as a threat, this dust head who sits on a park bench with his head bowed, walking around under the effect of dust, as his brother told you. He is a threat to T-Money, and he's going to pay \$5,000 to have this person killed? Would he have been better off paying \$5,000 to have heads of organizations like Luchie or O killed? He's going to

pay \$5,000 to have this minor dust head killed? Does that make

Summation - Mr. Lee

What we know -- slide 46 -- that Parsons is going to give them what they want. If you focus on the top, ladies and gentlemen, what does it say? If a murder is not committed for payment of money or for purposes of gaining entrance to or maintaining or increasing position in the CAC enterprise. What that means is -- I want you to focus on the top. If you don't commit a murder for payment of money or any of the other purposes there, but I'm focusing on the money aspect that Mr. Parsons is trying to give the government in his testimony to help them, if you don't say necessarily that the person committed murder, it's not a murder in aid of racketeering. Not guilty if the money was not offered, only -- not only, but you see that as a necessary element, that Parsons all of a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sudden prior --

MR. FEE: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. LEE: And it changed, ladies and gentlemen. You noted the story changed from just personal reasons to payment of money.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, to conclude, frankly,

Mr. Meregildo and I, we have no choice. Mr. Meregildo,

Ms. Stafford and I have no choice, but we do. We do trust you.

As long as you do your job, look carefully at what I said,

you'll reach the right resolution.

But let's look at what I stressed to you as -- excuse me one moment -- the shooting, the conspiracy to murder people That's the second charge that I told you. One of the at 321. Ladies and gentlemen, that charge, the essence of it is conspiracy to murder and participation by Mr. Meregildo in the murder and assault of 321 members. Well, ladies and gentlemen, again, there's only one witness against Mr. Meregildo as to that shooting of members of the 321 organization, and that's Bernard Folks. Ladies and gentlemen, one witness. But even -even if you believe that one witness, ladies and gentlemen, it fails to establish that Meregildo was part of a plan, part of a conspiracy to murder people or that he intended to be a part of that shooting, if it occurred, in front of 321, or that he intended to help or assist anybody. And we'll see why. The

reason why is, when you listen to the testimony, as I'm going to cite to you, it will become clear that at the time of the shooting, Joshua Meregildo never held a gun. Joshua Meregildo never shot a gun. He was barely at the scene of the shooting when it erupted and started. He never agreed or attended — intended to shoot anyone or to help or anyone be a part of it.

How do we know that there was no plan, no conspiracy? Well, first of all, Mr. Crocker had testified that at all these different shootings, once, twice a week, in 2010 -- we know that Mr. Meregildo was arrested in March 2011, but before he was arrested, on un -- different charges that are not for your consideration here, he was arrested for those, we know that Anthony Crocker says Meregildo is a person who never, never was involved in any of these shootings, once or twice a week, going down to the Maria Lopez crew to shoot at those people. No coincidence that he's not charged in that count. Even though it includes time when he's not in jail. And this is what Mr. Crocker said in slide number 47.

Joshua Meregildo, have you ever observed him to possess any firearm, ever?

No. No.

Never.

No.

Have you ever observed Meregildo possess and shoot a firearm at anybody?

No.

And all these incidents in 2010, weekly, twice weekly shootings, going down to Maria Lopez in 2010, no one ever told you that Joshua Meregildo was involved in any of these shootings at YG or Maria Lopez members, correct?

Correct.

Ladies and gentlemen, Meregildo is supposed to be a major member of this conspiracy, a major member of this so-called enterprise, and not even once, when this organization is going down to shoot at rival crews, he's not involved. He's not involved. He's not charged in a conspiracy to go shoot people at these crews, but he's supposed to be a main player, a member of this conspiracy.

Ladies and gentlemen, what we do know is, there's a lot of random acts of shooting, seemingly all the time, and what we learned about this shooting at 321, this is one of those unpredicted — unpredictable, spontaneous, random shootings, these incidents that occurred. But Meregildo was there but did absolutely nothing. And the testimony shows it from the one witness who was there and testified.

First of all, Devin Parsons said that Pierce called him to get a gun. And we look at slide 40 and he's asked:

How did it begin?

I was at my house, I was on the computer, Ski Box called me, told me to bring the gun to him.

Now we know that Meregildo was never in possession of a gun that evening when 321 members were shot, before, during, or after the shooting. And how do we know that? Look at slide number 49.

Bernard Folks, who was there:

And at that point, Mr. Meregildo, when you first met with him, did he not take possession of a gun, correct?

Correct.

And now we have the testimony from Mr. Folks himself that the whole thing was a spontaneous, unexpected occurrence, that not only did Mr. Folks not even expect or know what happened, because there was no plan, Mr. Pierce didn't apparently plan it, and Mr. Meregildo certainly didn't. But Mr. Folks himself says, and we see at page 50:

Mr. Folks, you had no idea there was going to be anyone in front of 321 at that time when you got out of the car?

I didn't know.

And am I correct, you did not know that anyone was going to be in front of 321; is that correct?

Yes.

So he just happened to see people in front of 321? Yes.

Do you recall saying nothing was planned? Nothing was planned for anything to happen?

Something like that. 1 Yes. And you weren't interested in having any sort of 2 3 problems with anyone connected to 321 because you lived there, 4 right? 5 Yes. 6 Again, at slide 51, he says: 7 It wasn't nothing planned. Where's the conspiracy, the agreement? It just was a 8 9 random, spontaneous thing. He said there was nothing planned. 10 It was all in the heat of the moment. 11 Again, he's asked again at slide 52: 12 You went there, speaking about there, you went there 13 to shoot people, right? 14 No. 15 You went there with a gun? I was living there. 16 17 That's why he went there. Now, ladies and gentlemen, if someone else -- as you 18 heard testimony, whether it's true as alleged that Mr. Pierce 19 20 flew off the handle, went crazy seeing people in front of 321, 21 and started shooting, Mr. Meregildo wasn't even on the scene at 22 that time, and I'll show you shortly why. 23 It was a totally unexpected occurrence, and how do we 24 know that? Because there was testimony that Meregildo had

barely stepped out of the cab when the shooting started in

front of 321. And we'll show you slide 53:

And you said that he, meaning Meregildo, had just gotten out onto the sidewalk, which is where the cab dropped you off, right?

Yes.

So he, meaning Meregildo, was just leaving the cab, right?

Yes.

Ladies and gentlemen, we can see at government -- at slide 54, Meregildo, we see that -- the testimony was right on the left of that tree is where the shell casings were recovered where the shooting occurred. That's the 321 shooting.

Now if you look at slide 55, you'll see -- you see 321, that front that we just saw, but you see where the street is, East  $153^{\rm rd}$ , where Meregildo just stepped off of? You see how far away that is from where the shooting occurred? Meregildo was just getting out of the cab when the shooting started, when the spontaneous, unplanned shooting occurred.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, how can Meregildo be responsible for what other people do when the other people did not even know it was going to happen? So the law requires you have to know that something is going to happen to be guilty of conspiracy, to have agreed or be a part of a plan, and you have to have intended to help. Merely being present, as Meregildo was, mere presence is not guilt.

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

22

21

23 24

25

Now -- and finally, ladies and gentlemen, it doesn't make sense, the government's theory. They say there was a plan to go have this shootout at the people of 321. Why would Meregildo go to a shootout unarmed? To be shot at? Why would he go there unarmed? Folks says he was armed but he didn't know there was a plan. Pierce allegedly was armed. Meregildo shows up and he's part of this plan. He's going there for the shootout at the "OK Corral" with the 321 members and he doesn't bring a gun to the shootout? Does that make sense?

Now, ladies and gentlemen --

Your Honor, could I have a warning as to the time, please?

THE COURT: Yes. You have 28 minutes.

MR. LEE: Thank you, your Honor.

Ladies and gentlemen, finally -- and this is the most disturbing charge of all against Mr. Meregildo, the most disturbing of all, the drug conspiracy charge. Ladies and gentlemen, I want somebody to place here one shred of evidence, one shred that Meregildo was involved in a conspiracy to sell drugs. It's no coincidence we have contradictory testimony, uncorroborated stories from cooperators that Meregildo didn't sell drugs, and I'll show you.

Slide 56. Bernard Folks is being questioned. And he says, if you see the bold:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I said every day or every day I would be with them, everybody else while they were selling.

Do you know what happens, ladies and gentlemen?

Bernard Folks, who was there every day, when he's asked, if you go back and read the testimony, and he names all the people that were on the street, on that strip, he doesn't say Meregildo was there selling.

But there's more. Slide 57. Again, Bernard Folks is asked this:

Did you ever see Meregildo, Joshua Meregildo, sell for T-Money?

No. I ain't see Meregildo deal any drugs.

Anywhere.

And then we see Devin Parsons, at slide 58, and he's asked:

And during what hours would you and others be selling crack cocaine?

24 hours.

How many days a week?

Every day.

Now if you read his testimony, he does not say that he saw Meregildo selling out on that strip. Ladies and gentlemen, if he's a member of this conspiracy, he's not selling at the location where members of the conspiracy sell, at their marketplace, at their strip, at their turf? He's not selling

1 there? Not once? Not once? And the conspiracy, where 2 everybody else said they were there every day, they never see 3 Meregildo. 4 And again, at slide 59. Devin Parsons again says this 5 about crack in particular: 6 Did you ever see Meregildo sell crack? 7 No. Crack cocaine? 8 9 Never. 10 Not once in a while; never. Now what's very 11 disturbing here, ladies and gentlemen, is that -- and then you 12 even have Aubrey Pemberton, at slide 60. You see every day 13 he's out there, never once does he say that he saw Meregildo 14 out there. 15 And then -- and at slide 61, again, Crocker, Anthony 16 Crocker, asked: 17 And again, you said you never saw once Joshua 18 Meregildo selling to anybody on that strip, correct? 19 Right. 20 Now, ladies and gentlemen, there is testimony that is 21 contradicted, and I just want to give you one example to show 22 you where the witnesses clearly contradict themselves. 23 First of all, look at slide 62, and follow me on this. 24 Anthony Crocker says, we was --

Carlos Villafranco testified:

1 We was in my girlfriend's house and Killa was chopping 2 up crack cocaine on a plate. 3 And who was present in the apartment? 4 Akon. 5 That's Bernard Folks. But Bernard Folks himself, the 6 person who Villafranco says was there, completely contradicts 7 it, and we see it on slide 63. Bernard Folks himself is asked: Did you ever see anyone from GFC bag up crack? 8 9 No. 10 Didn't we just see the slide where Villafranco said he 11 sees Meregildo bagging up crack? 12 And even further, we know from before -- we can show 13 slide 57 again. 14 Folks, the one who supposedly is right there when 15 Villafranco says that Meregildo is bagging up crack: I ain't seen Meregildo deal any drugs. 16 17 And even Parsons himself contradicts Carlos Villafranco. At slide 59, Parsons says, in response to this 18 19 question: 20 Did you ever see Joshua Meregildo sell crack? 21 No. 22 Crack cocaine? 23 Never. 24 Ladies and gentlemen, any possible corroboration that 25 Meregildo sold would have been possible but doesn't exist here.

And how do we know that? The government is arguing somehow 1 2 that Meregildo is a supplier to other members of GFC. A 3 supplier. But supplier is someone who has supplies. 4 accounts, ledgers, and has packaging material, drug 5 6 7

paraphernalia. It's in his residence. If he's not selling on the strip, if he's a supplier, where's Meregildo's supplies? Now, ladies and gentlemen, very disturbing. First of all, how do we know that that's true? Look at the -- look at slide 865. Agent Collins himself tells us, when he's

Based on your experience, Agent Collins, and -- in applying for search warrants, it's the case that drug traffickers commonly keep drug paraphernalia connected with the packaging and distribution of controlled substances in their residences?

Yes.

questioned:

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Well, what happens is, Agent Castillo shows up at Joshua Meregildo's residence, shows up at the other residence where he's sleeping, and she finds not one scintilla of The person who's supposed to be the supplier, ladies and gentlemen. They turn the apartment upside down. Ladies and gentlemen, they found nothing. No guns anywhere. They expected a gun inside a speaker. We never even saw the speaker. No drugs anywhere. Not one gram of crack, not one leaf of marijuana. Where is the supply of drugs that he's

Cbq1mer9

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summation - Mr. Lee

supposedly supplying to other people? And no drug paraphernalia. No ledgers, no account balances, not one Ziploc bag, no scales.

Ladies and gentlemen, when I say no evidence, I mean no evidence of criminal acts. The government wants to flash up photos of my client with his tattoos that he wants to be a member of something, and he wants to flash up photos of him with people signing, but not in one of those photos is Mr. Meregildo committing a criminal act. They want you to convict quilt by association because he's with other people, he's in the picture? Can you show me one photo -- and there is none -- one photo of Mr. Meregildo holding drugs? Can you show me one photo of Meregildo holding a gun? Can you show me one Facebook account, one Facebook posting by Meregildo about committing acts of violence, or drug selling? No controlled buys against him, no undercover buys directed against him, like other people who are co-defendants in this case, like Agent Castillo told us. No surveillance video of Meregildo selling drugs. No surveillance video of him holding guns, like Pemberton, holding a gun, running away from the shooting. Parsons said he saw a photo of himself holding a gun at the commission of a crime. Not one photo.

And they make a big deal of showing this gun, ladies The gun points to the murder. The gun does not and gentlemen. point to Meregildo, because there's no fingerprint evidence,

1

there's no DNA.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2425

There's no audiotapes of him discussing drugs. Just the story of cooperators.

Now these cooperators, ladies and gentlemen, ultimately, in closing, ultimately, the government's case rests on cooperators, the government's case against Meregildo. ladies and gentlemen, these are people -- they've admitted to you that they lie when it serves their purposes. Just remember the testimony. These people even said that they would plead quilty to committing a crime they did not even commit if it's going to get them out of jail early. They intentionally lied at their proffers if at the time they thought that it would be in their best interests and help them. Aubrey Pemberton pled quilty to a robbery he did not commit. Parsons lied at his proffer that he was involved in the Alston murder because he thought at the time that was the way to go. Villafranco lied at his proffer about his girlfriend being there and seeing something. They thought at the time that's the way, the easiest way to get out of trouble. Now, now that they're here, facing life, 70, 60 years, they've decided, with their plea agreements, what they'll do is, the easiest way is to help the government, get their 5K letters, and avoid their life sentences.

It's easy, ladies and gentlemen, just to come in here and say anything if your testimony is uncorroborated.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Cbq1mer9

Summation - Mr. Lee

Now just briefly about corroboration, very disturbing. You saw an instance where corroboration is important. You know when that was? Anthony Crocker misidentified somebody. You know, he's arrested and he says to himself, well, they want me to give information about T-Money's murder. They want me to provide information. I'm going to help them. I'm going to get them off my back, I'm going to throw the suspicion off of me because people are saying I'm involved with it. But you know what he does? After seeing a person for ten seconds, with a hood covering his face come up to T-Money and shoot him, he is shown a photo array, six photos, placed in front of him by the Six. Obviously one of those six or some of those six are suspects, and he knows that. They didn't show him a hundred photos. Six. To pick somebody out. And you know what he does? He picks somebody out based on ten seconds of viewing that person with a hood covering his face. And you know what? If there was no corroboration, if there was no way to investigate his words, that person he identified, just like Joshua Meregildo, could have been laying in his bed one morning and awoken and arrested for murder, based on him fingering him.

But you know what happened? There was corroboration, and the corroboration refuted him and revealed his lies. corroboration showed that that person was in jail. fortunately for that person, he was in jail, or else he might have been sitting here charged with murder.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Even worse, it's not going to stop Villafranco. He's going to give what he has to give if it's going to help him. And when they take him back and they say, you made a mistake, they show him another six, and you know what he does? He identifies somebody. I don't even want to think what happened to that other person they identified, where he is, what he's facing, based on ten seconds covered with a hood. That's what happened.

Ladies and gentlemen, if you're -- let me ask you this question, and I'm close to the end. If these cooperators, if they're willing to lie and say they did something, commit a crime that they didn't even commit, can you imagine they'd go before a judge, they tell the lawyer, they say, I committed a crime, and they didn't do it? They lie, because it's going to help them. It's going to get them out of jail. If you're going to lie and say about yourself that you did something you didn't even do, how easy is it then to lie about somebody else, just somebody else to save yourself, to say they did the crime? Are you going to say you yourself did a crime to avoid jail or get out sooner? How easy is it to say somebody else did it and save yourself from a life sentence, or 60 to 70 years? have no choice. They have no choice but to do what they're doing.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Fee makes a big -- a point about these horrible crimes that are being charged here. Yes,

Summation - Mr. Lee

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24 25

they are the most horrible crimes. Murder, shootings, drug Now what's worse than these crimes? I'll tell you selling. what's worse. Being wrongly convicted for them. And even worse than that, the person who lies and wrongly convicts you gets out free. That's the most horrible injustice of all.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Members of the jury, we're going to conclude now for this afternoon. Tomorrow morning we will hear the closing arguments from Mr. Miedel, followed by a short luncheon recess, then we'll hear closing argument by Mr. Becker, and then we'll take a short recess, and then we will hear a brief rebuttal from the government.

I suspect that tomorrow we'll be concluding earlier in the afternoon than today, but we'll see how it all goes, and then I'll give you my instructions on the law on Wednesday morning. If there's sufficient time tomorrow, I may deliver some or all of my instructions to you. But I suspect that we're going to be wrapping up in mid to late afternoon tomorrow.

So keep an open mind, come to no conclusions, and don't discuss the case.

Once again, tomorrow, to facilitate things, lunch will be provided to you, so you can plan on that, and you won't have to go out and face the stormy weather. They're predicting some rain, possibly some snow tomorrow. I'm not going to make any

24

25

Judge.

THE COURT: Anything further?

Cbq1mer9

Last week we left open the question of whether there was going to be a stipulation involving Mr. Miranda's medical admission. What's the story?

MR. BECKER: Your Honor, in light of the court's ruling, I'm not going to be seeking to introduce hospital records, given the limited nature of what I'm permitted to introduce, so there will be no stip.

THE COURT: All right. Very well.

Now am I correct that Mr. Miedel will be proceeding first tomorrow?

MR. MIEDEL: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Anything else?

MR. FEE: Your Honor, there has been a lot of communication by defense counsel -- and we appreciate that -- about proposed exhibit lists. If they could just get us any further revisions they have. I think they've all been accurate and agreed upon. I don't know if your Honor intends to hand this over -- I guess it would be Wednesday, the exhibit list.

THE COURT: It will go to the jury room right after I charge them.

MR. FEE: Then we have another night, but if they can get it to us, so we can incorporate it.

THE COURT: If there are any other knits on the charge, any typos, that kind of thing, please send an e-mail to my deputy so we can incorporate them, because I've got to have